

PHILOSOPHY

THE JOURNAL OF THE BRITISH INSTITUTE OF PHILOSOPHY

VOL. XIII. No. 52.

OCTOBER, 1938

THE PHILOSOPHY OF MYSTICISM ¹

THE VERY REV. W. R. INGE, K.C.V.O., D.D., F.B.A.

WILLIAM JAMES's famous book, *The Varieties of Religious Experience*, appeared in 1902. Ever since that date studies of the psychology of mysticism have poured from the press. In our own country we may name Evelyn Underhill, Mrs. Herman, and von Hügel. In France, Bastide, Murisier, Récéjac, Boutroux, Delacroix, Janet, Poulain, Bremond, Bergson, Bréhier. In America, besides William James, Starbuck, Leuba, Coe, Hocking, Rufus Jones, P. E. More, Pratt, Royce, Bennett. These lists are far from complete. In Germany the subject seems to have aroused less interest; but Otto, not long before his death, published a book dealing with it.

The psychological approach is characteristic of our time. The strong current of anti-rationalism, subjectivism, and relativity which has swept over America and many schools of thought in Europe, has threatened to banish ontology from philosophy, and to leave it with only the theory of knowledge, psychology, and ethics, which are the three parts of Höfding's *Philosophy of Religion*. The importance attached to religious experience has led to a fresh study of the writings of the mystics, which has been supplemented, especially in the United States, by the method of the questionnaire. Medical psychology has been called in, and even the psycho-analysts have offered their contribution.

I should be the last to disparage the value of these researches, which have thrown much light on some of the dark places of the human mind. One may indeed suspect that an undue amount of

¹ Lecture delivered at the Evening Meeting of the Institute on March 21, 1938.

attention has been given to the abnormal manifestations of a natural and healthy state of the soul. Some of the writers whose names I have mentioned would confine the word mysticism to the pathology of religion, a view which can hardly be held except by those who either give the word a meaning which it does not bear in religious philosophy, or who regard all except the most tepid religious devotion as pathological. Others are willing to treat the testimony of the mystics to their own experiences with great respect, and even to allow that their construction of reality may be as worthy of credence as that which forms the basis of naturalism. For instance, William James says, "The existence of mystical states absolutely overthrows the pretensions of non-mystical states to be the sole dictators of what we believe." Those who go as far as this have admitted that the mystical experience is one of the facts with which a comprehensive philosophy has to deal. F. H. Bradley's words are well known. "Nothing can be more real than what we experience in religion. The person who says that man in his religious consciousness is not in touch with reality does not know what he is talking about."

Nevertheless, it cannot be emphasized too strongly that psychology, while it remains within its self-imposed limits, is an abstract study, a branch of natural science. Its subject is the states of human consciousness in and for themselves. The relation of those states to objective reality falls outside the province of the psychologist. Dr. William Brown, who believes in the genuineness of the mystic sense of God, is careful to make this clear. "If I may speak no longer as a psychologist but as a man," he writes, "the experience of life confirms my belief that the possibility of some communion between that [divine] power and the individual is not an illusion."¹ Many, I suppose, would say that the question of the objectivity of the vision falls outside the scope of philosophy also, since in their opinion all truth is relative, and the quest of the absolute is vain. But those who believe this must remain for ever outside the world in which the mystic moves. For mysticism is essentially ontological; the contemplative cares nothing for states of consciousness. His business is with the ultimately real. He aspires to the vision of God, and believes that this vision is within his reach. If this quest is foredoomed to disappointment, he would be the first to agree with Murisier and Leuba that his whole life has been a delusion. That he may be deceived he knows well. All through his spiritual journey he is on his guard against "the false light"—against the snares of the Evil One, who can transform himself into an angel of light. But if there is no absolute standard whereby these fraudulent images are condemned as evil, while genuine revelations are accepted as coming from God, he is at the mercy of his own sinful and corrupt

¹ In his contribution to *Religion and Life*, p. 54.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF MYSTICISM

nature; his faith is vain, and his earnest, often agonizing prayers are futile.

It is because contemplation—I prefer on the whole to use this word, which is the word used in Catholic theology—is essentially ontological, standing or falling by the Platonic act of faith that “the completely real is completely knowable,” that there is and must be a philosophy of mysticism. That most of the mystics was not philosophers is true but irrelevant. If the pearl of great price for which they were willing to sacrifice everything is really there, the truth revealed to them is not only one of the facts of which philosophy has to take account; it is the culminating point of philosophy, the goal of knowledge, and the aim of conduct. Their method, as we shall see, involves a certain conviction about the Supreme Reality, a theory of knowledge of a quite distinctive kind, and a scheme of ascent to the goal of earthly existence, which is the vision of God. Although for many contemplatives this quest was embarked on as an act of faith, and proved empirically, it none the less rests on a definite philosophy.

The philosophy of mysticism has indeed been worked out by several thinkers of genius. Plato himself was a mystic, as we might gather from several passages in his dialogues, and most explicitly from the remarkable Seventh Epistle, of the genuineness of which almost all scholars are now convinced. The philosophy of contemplation must always be of the Platonic type. Its greatest thinker is of course Plotinus; but several Christian mystics have made valuable contributions—Augustine, for example, Eckhart, and Böhme, and even some Catholic saints who are not ranked as philosophers, like St. Bernard and St. John of the Cross. The scheme, in fact, is unusually definite and uniform in contemplatives divided by place, time, and creed.

There is, however, in my opinion, a very important difference, affecting the whole philosophy, between European and Asiatic mysticism. I use European and Asiatic as convenient terms; but there have been European thinkers who have belonged to what I have called the Asiatic type, and Indian thinkers, such as the great Sankara, the main subject of Otto's book, who, according to him, resist the world-renouncing tendency of Indian thought generally. This is the most important point that I shall have to deal with in this lecture, both on account of its decisive significance in forming an estimate of the philosophy of mysticism, and because of the strange misunderstanding which has vitiated most books about the Neoplatonists. I must return to the subject. Here I will only say that by mistranslating Plotinus's “the One” or “The First Principle” by the word God, and ignoring the whole rich world of supersensuous reality which is the spiritual home of the Platonist, they have

PHILOSOPHY

accused these thinkers of deifying an empty abstraction, and hypostatizing the Infinite Not. But this misunderstanding, which is inexcusable in the case of Plotinus, seems to me, judging from very inadequate knowledge of Indian philosophy, to be really characteristic of many of the Hindu thinkers. The sensible world for them is pure illusion; it teaches us nothing; and our refuge from it is in an undifferentiated Absolute with no qualities. Thus, it seems to me, they offer us a journey through the unreal, which can be no real journey, and a rest in the eternal which is too much like the sleep of death. There is much in Eckhart which seems open to the same criticism, though he does not carry these ideas through consistently. But European mysticism generally is free from this error, and I hope to show that the mystical theory of knowledge is inconsistent with it.

Among modern writers who have made contributions to the philosophy of mysticism I may name Edward Caird, Thomas Whittaker, Royce, von Hügel, Urban, K. E. Kirk, Dom Cuthbert Butler, Radhakrishnan and other Indians, de Burgh, Urwick, Bergson, and T. H. Hughes. The French Neo-Thomists, such as Gilson and Rousselot, are often helpful.

The word mysticism is so loosely used that I must make it quite clear what I do and do not mean by it. I am willing to accept most of the following definitions. Westcott, without mentioning the word, summarizes exactly what a Platonist believes about the approaches to the vision of God. "Religion in its completeness is the harmony of philosophy, ethics, and art blended into one by a spiritual Force, by a consecration at once personal and absolute. The direction of philosophy is theoretic, and its end is the true. The direction of ethics is practical, and its end is the good. The direction of art is representative, and its end is the beautiful. Religion includes these several ends, but adds to them that in which they find their consummation, the holy." (These last words will at once suggest Otto's book, *Das Heilige*, written long after Westcott. I am not in favour of making "the holy" a fourth, beside goodness, truth, and beauty. The sense of "the numinous" may be evoked by the contemplation of any of the three absolute values. Nor am I in favour of postulating a sort of sixth sense which the mystics, it has been suggested, possess for the apprehension of divine truth. Plotinus was saner when he said that we only need a faculty "which all possess, but few use"; though we must add that all possess it in very different degrees.) Leuba says shortly that mysticism is "an intuitive certainty of contact with the supersensible world." Pfeleiderer says: "Mysticism is the immediate feeling of the unity of the self with God; it is nothing, therefore, but the fundamental feeling of religion, the religious life at its very heart and centre." "It appears," says Pringle

THE PHILOSOPHY OF MYSTICISM

Pattison, "in connexion with the endeavour of the human mind to grasp the divine essence or the ultimate reality of things, and to enjoy the blessedness of actual communion with the highest. The first is the philosophic side, the second its religious side. The thought that is most intensely present with the mystic is that of a supreme, all-pervading, and indwelling Power, in whom all things are one. On the practical side, it maintains the possibility of direct intercourse with this Being of Beings. God ceases to be an object, and becomes an experience." R. L. Nettleship's words that "true mysticism is the consciousness that everything, in being what it is, is symbolic of something more" emphasizes one side of mysticism, a very important side, in my opinion. I cannot accept any definition which identifies mysticism with excited or hysterical emotionalism, with sublimated eroticism, with visions and revelations, with supernatural (dualistically opposed to natural) activities, or, on the philosophical side, with irrationalism. I suggest that a generation which treats its experience of ghosts with respect ought not to be rude about the experience of God.

I propose to divide my subject into three sections—ontological, the doctrine of ultimate reality; epistemological, the doctrine of knowledge; and ethical, the chart by which the mystic finds his way up the hill of the Lord.

The common assumption that God is so bound up with the world that it is as necessary to Him as He is to it is incompatible with mysticism. The Supreme, whether we call it God or with Plotinus the One or with Eckhart the Godhead, or with some moderns the Absolute, is transcendent. The notion that God is evolving with His universe, coming into His own, realizing Himself, or emerging, owes its popularity to "the last Western heresy," the idea that the macrocosm is moving towards "one far-off divine event." There can be no process of the Absolute, no progress, and no change. Exhortations to take time seriously may be in place when we are dealing with history; but to subordinate the Eternal to space and time is a fatal error in metaphysics.

In considering the status of Time and Change in reality, we cannot make ourselves independent of natural science. Our astronomers, when they are confronted with an impasse, may take refuge in Berkeleyan idealism; but this way of escape is illegitimate. We cannot begin with stars and atoms, treated as concrete realities, and end with mental concepts which have no necessary connexion with the phenomenal world on which all science is based. Now, however we may define progress, it is quite certain that it is a local, temporary, and sporadic phenomenon in some corners of the universe; to erect it into a cosmic law is not only fantastic but ridiculous. If anything can be pronounced absolutely certain, it is the irrevocable doom of

all life on our planet. And if God be involved in the evolution which we rashly assume to be an endless movement in one direction, then God must die.

Writers like Edward Caird seem to regard it as self-evident that the idea of unilateral activity, transeunt causation, is untenable. We are not dealing with physical attraction and repulsion, and I can see no difficulty in it. At any rate, if we reject it, all theism goes with it. Even thinkers so favourably disposed to Christianity as Pringle Pattison never really get beyond pantheism.

It is quite possible that mystical intuition is the source of ontology. In all philosophy we come to a point where we must trust our deepest convictions, which are not arrived at by any process of reasoning, but must be accepted as fundamental facts. Such, I maintain, are the absolute values, Truth, Goodness, and Beauty; and such is the conviction that behind the multiple there must be unity, behind the changing the immutable, behind the temporal the eternal. "*Quod est non fit nec fieri potest*," says Eckhart. Bradley accepts the dialectic of mysticism when he says, "The relational form implies a substantial totality beyond relations and above them. . . . The ideas of goodness and of beauty suggest in different ways the same result. We gain from them the knowledge of a unity which transcends and yet contains every manifold appearance."

The Platonists, following an important but perhaps isolated statement of Plato himself, place the One, the Absolute, "beyond existence." This expression is not used by the Christian mystics, but the difference is really verbal. When Eckhart says, "*Deus est suum Esse*," he means that God does not *have* Being, but *is* His own Being. When he says, "*Esse est Deus*," God is predicated of Being, not Being of God. Eckhart, like Plotinus, does not use "God" of the Godhead: "God and Godhead are as far apart as heaven and earth." Of the Godhead nothing positive can be affirmed; and though Eckhart protests that his method is only "*negatio negationis*," he is certainly in danger of leaving his Supreme Principle void of contents. "Do not prate about God," he says. We must also remember, in comparing Eckhart with Plotinus, that "*esse*" in scholastic theology is convertible with "*unum*" and "*bonum*," and that Plotinus warns us of the danger of trying to get beyond the sphere of Nous, in which the relation of subject and object still exists. In the kingdom of the "One-Many," subject and object correspond perfectly, and are inseparable, but they remain subject and object. "To rise above Nous is to fall outside it." This is one of the pregnant sayings which interpreters of Plotinus almost wilfully disregard. When we read in Scotus Erigena, "*Deus per excellentiam non immerito Nihilum vocatur*," we can understand the need of this warning.

There are two paths by which the mystic rises to the contemplation

THE PHILOSOPHY OF MYSTICISM

of the Absolute, the path of dialectic and the path of experience. The God of religion is rather the revelation than the revealer. The source of revelation cannot be revealed; the ground of knowledge cannot be known. The Monad is not an atomic individual, but the unity of a group; "the One is not one of the units which make up the number two." We have to postulate an absolute Unity behind the duality of the relational form, because we must not reduce either Nous or Noëton to dependence on the other. The philosophy of mysticism is neither subjective idealism nor crude realism.

The latest writer on the philosophy of mysticism, Mr. Hughes, is wrong in saying that Plotinus exhausts the resources of language to assert the personality of the One. The One "does not think;"¹ he is essentially Will only as being his own cause. But like almost all who speculate about the Absolute or the Unknowable, Plotinus tells us rather too much about him. His successors were driven by their dialectic to postulate some still more ineffable principle beyond the One. "No monad or triad," says Dionysius, "can express the all-transcending hiddenness of the all-transcending superessentially superexisting superdeity."

In what I have called Asiatic mysticism the denial of all value to the things of sense carries with it a blurring of all distinctions. "*Omnes creaturae sunt, unum purum nihil*," says Eckhart. Thus the supra-real and the infra-real are described by the same word. The Self, which is supposed to be all-inclusive, is really an empty category. Hegelians are fond of putting in the pillory Pope's line, "As full, as perfect in a hair as heart." If God is equally present in all things, He is equally absent in all things. This kind of pantheism does not differ very much from atheism, and moral distinctions disappear like all others. Hence the antinomianism of much Indian thought. The Hindu not only eats and drinks religiously; he sins religiously. Sometimes the Asiatic mystic uses language which in spite of its superficial subtlety is really meaningless and absurd. For instance, Jelaleddin writes:

I am the mast, the rudder, the steersman and the ship;
I am the coral reef on which it founders.

This is hardly parodied by Andrew Lang's:

I am the batsman and the bat;
I am the bowler and the ball,
The umpire, the pavilion cat,
The roller, pitch, and stumps and all.

¹ This may be established without my emendation (which I consider quite certain (in 3.9:3.) ἀλλ' οὐ νοεῖ τὸ πρῶτον ἐπέκεινα ὄντος for οὐ θεοῖ . . . ὄντες which makes no sense.

We cannot know the Infinite, for to know is to limit; but we can know the fact of the Infinite, for this is implied in the act of knowing. If the fact of limit only implies the indefinite, the act of limiting implies the infinite. When we have once committed ourselves, by an act of reasonable faith, to the belief that the fully real can be fully known, or, in another phrase of Plato's, that he who is filled with the most real is most really filled, we can hardly stop short of the last step, in which reason comes to rest where all distinctions are reconciled.

Plotinus and the Christian mystics all call the Supreme Principle the Good as well as the One. The Good in this connexion is not exactly a moral quality. The Good is the supreme object of all desire. It is the condition of knowledge, that which makes the world intelligible. It is the creator and sustainer of all things. The Good may be defined as unity as the goal of desire. This desire is said to be universal. "All things pray except the Supreme," says Proclus. The desire is not only universal but insatiable. "The soul," says Plotinus, "is always attaining and always aspiring." "Knowledge itself is desire." This is why it cannot be content even with the attainment of the *κόσμος νοητός* which is the Platonic heaven. The same craving for the infinite, for the felt presence of God Himself, is characteristic of all mysticism.

The dialectic thus leads logically to the point where it must abdicate in order to enter "naked," as they said, into the Holy of Holies. The word "irrational" is here most inappropriate. The reasoning faculty which the Greeks called *λογισμός* or *διάνοια* is the activity of the intellect only. But *νοῦς* is the whole personality unified under its own highest part. The faith which began as an experiment, and passed through illuminated understanding, ends as an experience. The intellect is in no way false to itself in recognizing its own limitations.

The path of the dialectic proceeds *pari passu* with inner experience. It might be expected, on the principles of mysticism, that since the human soul is a microcosm, having affinities with every grade of reality, there should be something in the soul which, if only in a flash, can transcend even life in the spiritual world, and find in itself a confirmation of what the dialectic affirms as to the primal source of all reality. This confirmation, according to the mystics, is given now and then in the indescribable experience of trance or ecstasy. That this is a real experience cannot be doubted. It comes in a sudden flash; so Plato describes it in his Seventh Letter, and so Augustine describes it in almost the same words. While it lasts, all the faculties of the mind are suspended; the subject hardly knows whether he is in the body or out of the body. He is convinced, when the vision is over, that he has been favoured with a real communion with the

THE PHILOSOPHY OF MYSTICISM

Highest. He cannot describe it, and it never lasts long. There is a curious consensus that about half an hour is what may be expected. The contemplatives have to find room in their scheme for what they believe to be the culmination of the divine favours to them; the apparent emptiness and formlessness of the vision must be a key to its character; and so they connect it with what the dialectic of their philosophy tells them about "the One beyond existence."

It is rash for one who has never experienced anything of the kind to hazard an opinion about it. In one sense the vision of God, as we may call it, occupies a very small place in philosophic mysticism. Plotinus believed himself to have enjoyed the beatific vision four times while Porphyry was his disciple; Porphyry himself had it once; the later Neoplatonists, instead of cheapening it, came to think that it was hardly to be enjoyed in this life. In the philosophic Christian mystics, like Eckhart, it is not stressed. In the ascetic mystics of the cloister the experience seems to have been tasted more often; and instead of being the very rare reward of a long course of ardent devotion and earnest contemplation, there was a tendency to warn aspirants after saintliness that these supernatural favours are often bestowed on beginners as an encouragement, and afterwards withdrawn. Among the lesser mystics we have to allow a heavy discount for hysteria, self-deception, and even unreality. This is fully admitted. St. John of the Cross writes of a certain nun, "All this that she says: God spoke to me; I spoke to God; seems nonsense. She has only been speaking to herself." It is safer, I think, to put aside the mass of "mystical phenomena" which fill the older books, and to study the acknowledged masters of the spiritual life. For them, these experiences are allowed to be extremely rare, and to be the reward of a long and arduous discipline. By far the greater part of recorded divine favours is of interest only to the psychologist, and not always even to him.

And yet we cannot tear out these visions from our scheme. Those who record them—I am speaking only of the leaders—are absolutely sure that they were genuine; they afforded the most exquisite sense of blessedness that can be imagined; and the effects on the character were permanent. The only point that may reasonably be doubted is whether they were rightly explained as a vision of God as He is (this question was hotly debated by the scholastic theologians), or of the "One beyond existence" of the Platonists. I am myself inclined to think that although progress may be possible within the sphere of the spiritual life—the heaven which the Platonists call *ἐκεῖ*, "yonder," it is hardly conceivable that the human soul should even for a moment escape from the conditions which belong to all finite existence. There must be something of the Absolute in us, say the Platonists; otherwise we could not see the Absolute. But I think

PHILOSOPHY

we should be wise to accept Plotinus's warning, quoted above, against trying to "wind ourselves too high," as Keble says.

We must be on our guard against confining contemplation and ecstasy to the religious life. There are, according to our view, three absolute values in which the nature of God is revealed to us. The earnest pursuit of any one of these may give rise to mystical phenomena. What is called nature-mysticism is an important branch of our subject. I will not quote from Wordsworth, the best-known example of this temperament. Almost equally well known is Tennyson's account of "a kind of waking trance which I have often had when I have been alone. All at once, individuality seemed to dissolve and fade away into boundless being, and this not a confused state but the clearest of the clear and the surest of the surest, utterly beyond words, where death was an almost laughable impossibility, the loss of personality seeming no extinction but the only true life." A third admirable example of nature-ecstasy may be found in *The Story of my Heart*, by Richard Jefferies.

Some philosophers have certainly tasted this kind of rapture. Bradley quietly says that "with certain persons the intellectual effort to understand the universe is a principal way of experiencing the Deity." And Einstein in an address to an American audience in 1930 says: "The religious geniuses of all times have been distinguished by this cosmic religious sense. . . . It seems to me that the most important function of art and science is to arouse and keep alive this feeling in those who are receptive."¹ Poincaré, I believe, went into ecstasy over mathematics.

From the point of view of the philosopher, the weak point in the mystical doctrine of the Absolute is the impossibility of explaining how the One can produce multiplicity out of itself. This is often regarded as fatal to the whole system. Thinkers who belong to this school are of course well aware of the difficulty. Plotinus argues that the universe would be incomplete unless every possible grade of being, from the highest to the lowest, were represented. But it is not clear how the perfect can be completed by the admixture of the imperfect. He uses metaphors—that of a full vessel overflowing, and that of light, which, as he supposes, is diffused without losing anything of its energy. At other times he says, "It had to be," which is to give up a problem which can have no solution. The difficulty is not confined to this school of thought. It is wisest to admit that we know neither how nor why there is a universe. The upward path, the return to God, may be traced, and a chart made of the journey. Heraclitus says that the road up and the road down are the same. But the road down, from the Creator to the creatures, is no business of ours, and frankly we know nothing about it.

¹ From T. H. Hughes, *The Philosophic Basis of Mysticism*, p. 186.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF MYSTICISM

Mysticism asserts that the world was created, but not in Time. It was not formed by the splitting up of the Absolute into parts, an impossible conception, nor is the time-series the course of God's life. Eckhart is determined to banish the imagery of Time and Space from his conception of the Godhead. God, he admits, "becomes and disbecomes"; but this is only an accommodation to our ways of thinking in our outward relations. But "*Now* is the minimum of Time. Small though it be, it must go; everything that Time touches must go. *Here* means place. The spot I am standing on is small, but it must go before I can see God." "There is no greater obstacle to God than Time."

Accordingly, the Christian doctrine of the creation of the world in Time is a great stumbling-block to the philosophic mystic. Some had the courage to deny it; others, like St. Thomas Aquinas, say that though all the arguments are against it, we must accept it because it is revealed truth. How such a fact could be revealed is a question which does not trouble him. Creation, but not in Time, means logical posteriority or axiological inferiority; and this is all that mystical philosophy cares to assert.

Whittaker says that if the Second Law of Thermodynamics is a cosmic law, Neoplatonism as a philosophy is disproved. This law, the principle of Carnot as the French call it, tells us that all the energy in the universe is being irrevocably dissipated into space in the form of radiation, so that the time will come when there will be no more life anywhere, and no relics of the universe except some aggregations of incombustible "ash." There are very great philosophical difficulties in this theory. It implies that the universe started "with a bang," as Eddington says, at a point of time which we could date if we knew it; it contradicts the mathematical principle that every process is theoretically reversible; and it raises the question whether there can be such a thing as empty Time, in which nothing will ever happen any more. A common-sense objection might say, "If the universe is running down like a clock, it must have been wound up like a clock. And whatever Power wound it up once may presumably wind it up again." The principle of Carnot is obviously fatal to the theory of universal or even human perfectibility, and (I should say) to such deification of history as that of Croce. I do not think Neoplatonic mysticism takes Time seriously enough to be destroyed by any theory of what happened in the past or will happen in the future. But the question is very difficult, and the astronomers who have discussed it are not, I think, very well equipped for metaphysical problems.

It is a mystical doctrine, to which Plotinus gives great importance, that all creativity is the result of contemplation. The One, by contemplating itself, produces the world of spiritual reality, the "intelligible

world." This in turn, the world of νοῦς-νοητά, by contemplating the One, generates the world of Soul; and Soul, by contemplating the Intelligibles, generates the world of phenomena. Each product is inferior to its archetype, which it resembles as far it can. Every creator then creates, so to speak, with his back turned. This principle has a practical importance in social ethics. The motto of the mystic is, "See that thou make all things according to the pattern showed thee in the mount."

Before leaving this section of my subject, I will quote the words of J. M. Baldwin's *Thought and Things*.¹ "In the highest form of contemplation, the strands of the earlier and diverging dualisms are merged and fused. In this experience of a fusion which is not a mixture, but which issues in a meaning of its own sort and kind, an experience whose essential character is just this unity of comprehension, consciousness attains its completest, its most direct, and its final comprehension of what reality is and means." This, we may say, is the beatific vision of the philosopher, which comes to him, like most discoveries, in a flash. As Augustine says, "*Mens mea pervenit ad id quod est in actu trepidantis aspectus.*"

If my subject were Neoplatonism as a mystical philosophy, instead of the philosophy of mysticism generally, I should take pleasure in proving how very misleading Edward Caird, followed, as he admits, by von Hügel, is in placing what religion calls salvation in the transient experience of ecstasy, instead of in the rich and bright kingdom of real existence, the intelligible world. But I have vindicated what I believe to be the truth in my book on the philosophy of Plotinus, and I have not much to add to what I said twenty years ago. The intelligible world, which I have called the spiritual world, having decided that "Spirit" is the least misleading of possible translations of νοῦς, is the heaven of the Platonist. It is the "place" or state in which individuality survives without separateness; where there are no barriers to complete knowledge of other spirits except those which come from differences of nature; where the divine Goodness, Wisdom, and Beauty are fully present and active; whose perfect fruition is not idle but creative; where, as Plotinus says, "Spirit possesses all things at all times simultaneously. It *is*; it knows no past nor future; all things in the spiritual world coexist in an eternal Now." "Eternity is God manifesting His own nature; it is Being in its calmness, its self-identity, its permanent life." "Nothing that *is* can ever perish" (οὐδέν ἀπολείται τῶν ὄντων).

This full, rich, happy life is what "the Soul become Spirit," "the spirit in love," yearns after and attains. I insist that the greatest of the mystics makes this life in the intelligible world the centre of his system. But can we deny that many of the mystics, both in Chris-

¹ From T. H. Hughes, *op. cit.*, p. 83.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF MYSTICISM

tianity and other religions, have practically adopted another philosophy, traces of which we have already found in Eckhart, a philosophy which begins by denying all value to the world of becoming, which proceeds by peeling the onion, stripping off one after another all that gives colour, variety, interest to life in this world, and ends by grasping zero and calling it infinity?

This is an unsympathetic verdict on the negative way, which has played so important a part in the history of mysticism. It proceeds, I think, from intense concentration of the will upon the goal, which is the vision of God, undimmed by mists and veils. Each experience is rejected in turn as not good enough. "Neti, neti," "not this, not this," as the Indians have said. It is not realized, as I have said already, that a journey through the unreal is an unreal journey. It is not realized that there are degrees of truth and reality, and that we must take with us whatever on our upward journey we have gained of positive value.

My acquaintance with Indian mysticism is only slight; but it does seem to me that the intelligible world, with its rich contents, simply drops out of their scheme. And the intelligible world is not a super-numerary physical world, nor a new heaven and earth to be brought into being hereafter. It is the world which we know, seen as it really is, *sub specie aeternitatis*. πάντα ἐνταῦθα ὅσα καὶ ἐκεῖ; all that is in heaven is also on earth. This is one of the pregnant dicta of Plotinus which his commentators have entirely failed to notice.

The theory of reality as constituted by the unity in duality of thought and its object is worked out with great subtlety both by Plotinus and Proclus. It deserves, I think, more attention than either realists or idealists have given to it. But this again belongs rather to a study of Neoplatonism than of mysticism generally, and I will again refer to my book on Plotinus, where it is explained at length. But the theory of knowledge is an essential part of all mystical philosophy, and I must try to give some account of it.

The beatitude, "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God," might be called mystical theology in a nutshell. These writers are fond of saying that like can only be known by like, or in a favourite image, "We could not see the sun if there were not something sunlike in our eyes." This law, which is assumed to be self-evident, underlies the whole theory and practice of mysticism. The soul is the wanderer of the metaphysical world. It has its affinities with every grade of being, from the highest to the lowest. It has, as we have seen, a mysterious faculty at the apex of its being which is capable of entering into relations with the Absolute, or, as the Christians said, into immediate relations with God. This was the foundation of the curious theory that in every human soul there is a something which can never consent to sin. This was called by

various names, such as the soul-centre, the spark, or the odd word *synteresis*. Plotinus also had made the highest part of the soul impeccable. It was a debated point among the later members of the school whether the soul "comes down" (the spatial metaphor should not mislead us) entire, or whether part of it remains "yonder" in the spiritual world. The majority of the school differed here from Plotinus; for, as Iamblichus asks, "If the will can sin, how is the soul impeccable?" It enables Plotinus to take a charitable view of sin. "Vice," he says, "is always human, mixed with something contrary to itself."

If the soul lost contact completely with the spiritual world, it could never rise any higher. The Christian doctrine of grace does not contradict this, for grace, or the Holy Spirit, imparts itself, and becomes, we may say, part of the personality. The spark, according to the bolder mystics, was lighted directly at God's altar, and was actually a divine activity.

Spiritual progress and knowledge of reality proceed in parallel lines. We all make a world after our own likeness. Such as men themselves are, such will God appear to them to be. Thus, although mysticism is built upon a basis of rationalism, at every step we can only see what we deserve to see. The world that we know changes for us, just as a landscape changes as we climb a mountain. It seems to follow that we have no right to dispute what the mystics tell us that they have seen, unless we have been there ourselves and not seen it. When we study the record of the discipline to which the contemplatives subject themselves, we are not likely to claim that we have stood where they have been.

Psychologists, of course, have been at work upon these experiences, and have brought in their favourite idea, "the subconscious," or "subliminal self." There is a subconscious life, a storehouse of powers, instincts, intuitions, inhibitions, good and bad, which now and then come imperfectly into consciousness. But it seems to me very misleading to confound this with the inmost sanctuary of the soul in which the mystic is convinced that the Holy Spirit has His abode. There is nothing respectable about the subconscious as such. It is not as foul as Freud makes out, but it is not the seat of what is best in us.

Christian contemplatives, as early as Clement of Alexandria about A.D. 200, have divided the course into three sections, purification, enlightenment, and unitive love. Clement puts faith in the first place, faith being, to use a recent definition, that of Frederic Myers, the resolution to stand or fall by the noblest hypothesis. This reasonable venture is combined with a determined effort to cleanse the soul of all that may impede its upward progress. But it is worth while to insist that both Plotinus and some of the Christian mystics require

THE PHILOSOPHY OF MYSTICISM

the aspirant first of all to practise the "civic virtues," those which society requires of us. The discharge of this debt must precede even the cleansing, chiselling, and polishing of our own statue which Plotinus tells us that we must work at.

The second state, enlightenment, means that we have come to realize the existence of new values, to which we were at first blind. These values become facts which our philosophy must find room for. Then, as Clement says, "Knowledge, as it passes into love, unites the known with the known. He who has reached this stage may be called equal with the angels."

It is not suggested that the need of purification and enlightenment can ever be outgrown. But there is a real change in the personality. Plotinus calls it "the soul becoming *νοῦς*; St. Paul calls it the change from the psychic to the pneumatic man. The Christian writers, following St. Paul, prefer *πνεῦμα* to *νοῦς*; but the words are practically identical.

This raises the important question whether the philosophy of mysticism leaves room for the idea of personality in God and man. "Mysticism," says Keyserling, "always ends in an impersonal immortality." In considering this problem, we must remember that neither ancient philosophy nor Christian theology had any word for personality, nor felt the want of any word. "Hypostasis" and "*persona*" by no means corresponded in meaning, and when these words were applied to the "Persons" of the Trinity, neither of them meant anything like what we mean by personality. When modern theologians make personality the centre of their system they are at best translating Christian philosophy into an alien dialect. They are using a new category which was neither used nor missed by ancient thought. For instance, Pringle Pattison says, "Each self is a unique existence, which is perfectly impervious to other selves—impervious in a fashion of which the impenetrability of matter is a faint analogue." Scientifically, the illustration is as unfortunate as the Neoplatonic notion that light loses nothing in radiation; but how utterly contrary to traditional philosophy is this strange doctrine of impervious selves, "*solida pollentia simplicitate!*" Mysticism denies it *in toto*. Lewis Nettleship unconsciously paraphrases Plotinus when he says, "Suppose that all human beings felt habitually to each other as they now do occasionally to those they love best. So far as we can conceive of such a state, it would be one in which there would be no more individuals at all, but an universal being in and for another; where being took the form of consciousness, it would be the consciousness of another which was also oneself—a common consciousness." As Plotinus says of the life yonder, "each is all and all is each, and the glory is infinite."

The Christian mystics use extravagant language about the necessity

of abolishing the "I" and "mine." These are barriers between the soul and reality, which must be levelled. If this looks like abolishing personality, the answer is that the abstract Ego, a figment, is quite different from the full and rich experience to which we hope to attain, a unification and concentration which is at the same time infinite expansion. The centre remains, but the circumference is boundless. "*Christus in omnibus totus*" is the Christian form of what the Neoplatonists say about the undivided *νοῦς*.

The idea of an abstract ego seems to imply three assumptions—that there is a sharp line separating subject and object; that the subject, thus sundered from the object, remains identical through time; and that this impervious entity is in some mysterious way both myself and my property. The mystics would deny all three. "It is not *my* soul," says Eckhart, "which is transformed after the likeness of God."

In Aldous Huxley's new book, *Ends and Means*, there is an interesting discussion of this subject. Fully agreeing with the words of Keyserling which I have just quoted, he says, "Those who take the trouble to train themselves in the arduous technique of mysticism always end, if they go far enough in their work of recollection and meditation, by losing their intuitions of a personal God, and having direct experience of a reality that is impersonal." He goes on to argue that the worship of a personal God is a lower kind of religion, which generally ends in attributing to the Deity very human passions, and which encourages the mawkish sentimentality and emotionality which were encouraged in the Counter-Reformation, and from which, he thinks, Catholic Christianity has never completely recovered. "It has also led to that enormous over-valuation of the individual ego, which is so characteristic of Western popular philosophy."

I think there is much truth in this. But when an educated Christian insists that God is personal, he means mainly that prayer is not a soliloquy. Meredith's saying, "He who rises from his knees a better man, his prayer has been granted," does not quite satisfy us. It is also true that only the permanent can change. Impersonal is a negative word. Plotinus insists that distinctness is real, though separateness is transcended: *δεῖ ἕκαστον ἕκαστον εἶναι*.

The true mystical doctrine is that each man's self is determined by his prevailing interests. Where our treasure is, there will our heart, our self, be also. What we love, that we are. Most of us live on the psychic, the intermediate plane; we may rise above this, or fall below it. Our personality is what we are able to realize of our opportunities, which are potentially infinite. The ego or self is not given us to start with; we do not yet know ourselves. The mystics speak of a strong attraction which the higher exerts upon the lower. We are drawn upwards by love and desire for what is above us. The

THE PHILOSOPHY OF MYSTICISM

Greeks speak quite confidently of the universal desire to *know*; it would be well if modern ethics made more of this. Platonism speaks of the attraction of the *beautiful*; this again should not have been ignored. The desire for the vision of God, the *morally* perfect Being, has been emphasized by all Christian contemplatives. But the prayer of Crashaw, "Leave nothing of myself in me," is understood by all of them. "Personality only exists because we are not pure spirits," says Lotze. It is a question of defining a word. We might say with equal truth that pure spirits alone are fully personal, and that personality in its ideal perfection exists only in God.

I pass to another problem. "Mysticism," says Nettleship, "is the belief that everything in being what it is is symbolic of something more." "Every truth," says Pennington the Quaker, "is shadow except the last. But every truth is substance in its own place, though it be but a shadow in another place. And the shadow is a true shadow, as the substance is a true substance." This has been called nature-mysticism; it is as prominent in some mystics as it is absent in others. "The invisible things of God," says St. Paul, rather unexpectedly, from what we should gather of his temperament, "are clearly seen, being understood from the things that are made." The philosophical question is whether, as Plato thought, the visible world may lead us up to the perception of the divine Forms, or whether, as some mystics have held, they are mere hindrances, "the corruptible body pressing down the soul." The truth seems to be that all life is sacramental, but in various degrees. The mystic does not need "mere forms," and often rejects cultus and ritual for this reason; but to the devout worshipper these are not mere forms.

It has been said that dogmatic theology is only the intellectual presentation of mystical symbols. I do not altogether like this; for the subject-matter of dogmatic theology is very largely the pictorial imagery which is the natural language of devotion among the "*simpliciores*." To represent eternal truth under the forms of space and time, the universal as the particular, the action of God in the world as miracle, is natural and normal in popular religion. But this movement is in the opposite direction from mysticism, which always views these pictorial presentations of divine truth with impatience, and often tries to dispense with them. The well-known couplets of Angelus Silesius have all this motive. "Were Christ born a thousand times in Bethlehem, and not in thee, thou art lost eternally." "Where the body dies," says Böhme, "there is heaven and hell. God is there, and the devil, each in his own kingdom. The soul needs only to enter by the deep door in the centre." "This pearl of eternity," says William Law, "is the temple of God within thee, where alone thou canst worship God in spirit and in truth. This adoration in spirit is that truth and reality of which outward forms are only the figure

for a time." "Heaven is not a thing without us," says Whichcote, "nor is happiness anything distinct from a true conjunction of the mind with God." It is needless to multiply quotations; this language is common to all the mystics. The best of them insist that a symbol must have a real resemblance to the thing symbolized. Fanciful and "loose types of things through all degrees," as Wordsworth calls them, are no part of true mysticism.

Necromancy, astrology, alchemy, palmistry, and spiritualism are the reproach of mysticism, and have nothing to do with the philosophy which is our subject. It may be, as the later developments of Neoplatonism suggest, that this philosophy is inadequately protected against these perversions; but we need not stop to deal with either these or with the morbid hallucinations which fill Catholic histories of the mystics.

"It is an accursed evil to a man," Darwin once wrote, "to become so absorbed in any subject as I am in mine." That great man realized what a sacrifice he was making, and we honour him for it. The contemplatives of the cloister were even more absorbed in their inner conflicts than Darwin was in natural history, and of course they suffered for it severely, sometimes even to the peril of their reason; we ought to be able to make allowances for the effects on the mind of extreme specialization, carried on under the unnatural conditions of monasticism.

This extreme concentration has had an unfortunate effect on the ethics of mysticism. I am excused from discussing this subject both by limitations of space and by my title, which confined me to the philosophy of mysticism. I cannot therefore consider the relation of mysticism to asceticism. The Platonic mystic lives in strict training; if he does not, he is a dilettante. But he does not maltreat his body, which on the contrary he tries to keep fit. The Indian fakir, the pillar-saint, the flagellant, are an aberrant type, practically extinct in the West. We may leave them to the student of morbid psychology.

It may be said that the desire to torment the body follows logically from the dualistic philosophy which connects evil with matter. Metaphysical dualism is inconsistent with mystical philosophy, the natural tendency of which is to deny any substantiality to evil, and even to regard it as an illusion belonging to an imperfect knowledge of a half unreal stage of existence. It is no solution of the problem to say that evil is only *privatio boni*; the ethical scale of values contains minus quantities, which must somehow be acknowledged. The doctrine that "matter," which in Neoplatonism is of course immaterial, the phantasmal substratum of all that exists, is somehow responsible for evil is not very different from saying that evil has no positive being. But in practice "the flesh" was often substituted

THE PHILOSOPHY OF MYSTICISM

for "matter," and a kind of subordinate dualism, never countenanced by the leaders of the school, attached itself to the popular preaching of Platonism. This notion, which took deep root in the East, quite apart from mysticism, undoubtedly encouraged the aberrations which I have mentioned. But it is no part of our subject.

The unfortunate effect of the detachment of the cloistered mystics from ordinary life is seen in their almost callous indifference to public misfortunes and private sorrows. When Plotinus says almost contemptuously that if men object to seeing their native towns destroyed by an enemy, and their friends and relations killed or led into captivity, they ought to learn to fight better, we feel that for him the city of which the type is laid up in heaven has severed all connexion with Rome and Alexandria, the fortunes of which were beginning to arouse grave anxiety among all good citizens. Spinoza, we may remember, is equally callous about the wars which were devastating Europe in his time. When Jerome describes how the widow Paula deserted her orphan children: "On the shore the little Toxotius stretched forth his hands in entreaty, while Rufina, now grown up, besought her mother to wait till she should be married. But Paula's eyes were dry as she turned them heavenwards," we feel the disgust which that most unpleasant saint often arouses in us. The Blessed Angela of Foligno is not the only saint who congratulates herself on the deaths of husband and children, "who were a great hindrance to my life of devotion." The fact that the love of country, and family affection, may be the shortest road up the hill of the Lord was hidden from them. But once again, that is not the fault of the philosophy.

Mysticism as a philosophy will not satisfy anti-intellectualists or pragmatists or sceptics or agnostics or materialists or those who take Time so seriously as to put God inside it. It is a philosophy of absolutism, which offers an experimental proof of itself. The proof is terribly hard, because it requires the dedication of the whole life to an end which is not visible when we begin to climb. Our world must change again and again, and we with and in it. The pearl of great price is there, and within our reach; but we must give all that we have and are to win it. As the Stoic Manilius says:

*Quid caelo dabimus? Quantum est, quo veneat omne?
Impendendus homo est, Deus esse ut possit in ipso.*

THE ETHICAL DOCTRINE OF HOBBS

PROFESSOR A. E. TAYLOR

THE moral doctrine of Hobbes, in many ways the most interesting of our major British philosophers, is, I think, commonly seen in a false perspective which has seriously obscured its real affinities. This is, no doubt, largely due to the fact that most modern readers begin and end their study of Hobbes's ethics with the *Leviathan*, a rhetorical and, in many ways, a popular *Streitschrift* published in the very culmination of what looked at the time to be a permanent revolution, and do not pay such attention to the more calmly argued statements of the same doctrine contained in the *Elements of Law*, circulated before the outbreak of the Civil War, or the *De Cive*, produced (apart from the explanatory notes appended in the second edition of 1646) before the issue of the conflict could have been thought to be already decided by "the sword." As a corrective to misunderstandings based on exclusive attention to the *Leviathan*, I shall, in these pages, take my references to Hobbes almost entirely from the *De Cive*, and, for convenience' sake, I will use the text of the English version, *Philosophical Rudiments concerning Government and Society*, printed in 1651 and reproduced in Vol. II of Molesworth's edition of the *English Works*. (I have remarked a few errors in this volume, notably the total perversion of Hobbes's sense by the omission of a whole line of text in XVI, 16, p. 245, of Molesworth.¹ But with these few exceptions it seems to me a sufficiently faithful rendering for my purposes.)

The impression which the average reader of the *Leviathan* carries away with him might, I think, be fairly summed up thus. (I assume that the reader has really read Hobbes's text, and not merely run away with the *malicious* interpretation suggested by the singular essay prefixed to the Clarendon Press edition of it.) The answer to the question *what ought a good man to do?* is the simple one that he ought to obey the political "sovereign" without asking any

¹ In the original Latin text of the sentence Hobbes says, as we should expect him to say in the course of an attempt to prove that the supreme power, both spiritual and temporal, was possessed, in the days of the Israelite and Jewish monarchies, by the kings, that the priests could only do rightfully what God commanded them, whereas the king had rightfully all the power over every man which that man had over himself (*sacerdos id tantum iure poterat quod Deus iuberet, rex autem iure poterat quicquid poterat iure unusquisque in se*). In Molesworth's edition this is represented by the sense-destroying statement that "the priest could do rightly whatsoever every man could rightly do himself."

THE ETHICAL DOCTRINE OF HOBBS

questions or making any difficulties, and the reason why he ought to do this is equally simple. It can be shown, if not to demonstration, yet with overwhelming probability, that he stands personally to lose by doing anything else, and the object of every man's desire is "always some good to himself." It is my personal interest that the miseries of anarchy should be prevented; by disobeying the civil law in any particular, I am, so far, contributing to the recurrence of anarchy; *ergo*, it is always to my interest to conform to the law. And to say that this is to my interest is equivalent to saying that it is my duty; my duty, in fact, means my personal interest, calmly understood. That this should be popularly accepted as an adequate account of Hobbes's teaching about morality may be partly explained by historical causes. When Butler set himself to expose the fallacies of the "selfish" psychology of human action, he found admirable examples of them in some of Hobbes's analyses of the "passions," and he did the work of refutation so thoroughly that he has perhaps made the notion that there is nothing in Hobbes but this "selfish psychology" (a charge which he himself is careful never to make) current from his day to our own. Partly also I think Hobbes himself must be held unintentionally responsible for the result. The *Leviathan* is far the most readable and amusing of his works, and it was written in a time of revolution and unsettlement as a persuasive to cessation from fruitless civil strife. For its immediate purpose, as an exhortation to peace, it was right and proper that the author should develop the contention that peace is the real interest of his fellow-countrymen as persuasively as he could; it is not surprising, therefore, that it attains such dimensions in his book as to give the impression that it is really all, or almost all, that he has to say.

And yet it is not all, nor nearly all. There are really two distinct questions before Hobbes, the question why I *ought* to behave as a good citizen, and the question what inducement can be given me to do so if my knowledge of the obligation to do so is not in itself sufficiently effective. According to his repeated declarations, it is a certain fact of psychology that I shall violate the law and break the peace if I believe that I stand to gain by doing so.¹ Hence the

¹ Thus (*De Cive*, V, 1): "It is of itself manifest that the actions of men proceed from the will, and the will from hope and fear, in so much as when they shall see a greater good or less evil likely to happen to them by the breach than observation of the laws, they will wittingly violate them." Hence Hobbes goes on to maintain that the moral guilt of offences into which subjects are led by the insufficiency of the penalties provided for them falls not in the subject but on the sovereign. "If, therefore, the legislator doth set a less penalty on a crime, than will make our fear more considerable with us than our lust, that excess of lust above the fear of punishment, whereby sin is committed, is to be attributed to the legislator, that is to say, to the supreme" (*De Cive*, XIII, 16).

importance for him of arguing that I never really stand to gain by such conduct, since the recurrence of the state of "war of every man against every man" is a disadvantage to me which cannot be offset by any compensating advantage. But the Hobbian answer to the other question, why I ought, or am obliged, to be a good citizen is quite different; it is, quite explicitly that I have, expressly or tacitly, pledged my word to be one, and to violate my word, to refuse to "perform my covenant as made," is *iniquity*, *malum in se*.¹ Hobbes's ethical doctrine proper, disengaged from an egoistic psychology with which it has no logically necessary connection, is a very strict deontology, curiously suggestive, though with interesting differences, of some of the characteristic theses of Kant.

This comes out particularly strikingly in the passage in *De Cive* (III, 5), where Hobbes is explaining the difference between the justice of an act and the justice of a person. A just *act* is "what is done in accord with right," but a man who does acts which are in accord with right is not *eo ipso* a just *man*. "When the words are applied to persons, *to be just* signifies to be delighted in just dealing, to study how to do righteousness, or to endeavour in all things to do that which is just; and *to be unjust* is to neglect righteous dealing, or to think it is to be measured not according to my contract, but some present benefit. . . . That man is to be accounted just, who doth just things because the law commands it, unjust things only by reason of his infirmity; and he is properly said to be unjust, who doth righteousness for fear of the punishment annexed unto

¹ When he is speaking strictly, Hobbes makes a distinction between *injustice* and *iniquity*, though the distinction is not always carefully kept up (less carefully, I think, in *De Cive* than in *Leviathan*). Injustice, in the strictest sense of the word, is possible only in the "civil" state, since it is by definition disregard of the commands of the lawful sovereign. Iniquity, which can exist in "the state of nature," or in the conduct of the sovereign, who, since he is not subject to his own commands, cannot be guilty of injustice proper, is violation of the "natural law," which is also, according to Hobbes's repeated explanations, the *moral law*. But since my obligation to obey the sovereign is based on the assumption that by living under his protection I have expressly or tacitly "covenanted" with all my neighbours to accept his commands as the rule of life, and the obligation to observe a "covenant" is thus antecedent to the institution of civil society, the moral guilt of "injustice" arises from the fact that all injustice is also *iniquity*, and therefore breach of the moral law, though not all iniquity is "injustice." Even in the "state of nature" to which, according to the *Leviathan*, it is "consequent" that no act can be just or unjust, *wanton* violation of a promise could be iniquitous. (It is true that since, according to Hobbes's psychology, a man inevitably acts to secure what he believes to be his own greatest good, really wanton promise-breaking could never occur. The promise-breaker would always be acting from the "reasonable" motive that he hoped to secure more good by breaking his word than by keeping it.)

THE ETHICAL DOCTRINE OF HOBBS

the law, and unrighteousness by reason of the iniquity of his mind."¹

This is precisely Kant's distinction between action done merely in accord with law and action done from law, with the characteristic difference that Hobbes is trying to reduce the law from which the virtuous man acts to the single law that a promise once duly fulfilled must be kept, and Hobbes is laying himself open to the very same line of argument which has, fairly or unfairly, been used against Kant, that a "good will" which wills nothing but this conformity to laws because it is law, is formal and empty.

Indeed, Hobbes actually goes as far as to anticipate Kant's attempt to reduce all really wrong willing to the irrational attempt to will both sides of a contradiction at once. Thus we read (*De Cive*, III, 3, and the argument is equally used in other expositions of his theory) "There is some likeness between that which in the common course of life we call *injury*, and that which in the schools is usually called absurd. For even as he who by arguments is driven to deny the assertion which he first maintained, is said to be brought to an absurdity; in like manner, he who through weakness of mind does or omits that which before he had by contract promised not to do or omit, commits an injury, and falls into no less contradiction than he who in the schools is reduced to an absurdity. For by contracting for some future action, he wills it done; by not doing it, he wills it not done; which is to will a thing done and not done at the same time, which is a contradiction. An injury therefore is a kind of absurdity in conversation, as an absurdity is a kind of injury in disputation." "There is in every breach of covenant a contradiction properly so called; for he that covenanteth, willeth to do, or omit, in the time to come; and he that doth any action, willeth it in the present, which is part of the future time, contained in the covenant; and therefore he that violateth a covenant, willeth the doing and the not doing of the same thing, at the same time; which is a plain contradiction. And so injury is an absurdity of conversation, as absurdity is a kind of injury in disputation." The thought here is at bottom the same as Kant's, but for the differences that (1) Hobbes, for his own reasons, reduces all "injury" to the violation of an express or implied promise; (2) and he has not, like Kant, thought of the "universalizing of a maxim" as a criterion of its freedom from contradiction. But the really important point is that Hobbes agrees with Kant on the "imperative" character of the moral law, exactly as he also agrees with him in the assertion that it is the law of "right reason."

¹ Cf. *De Cive*, IV, 21. "Although a man should order all his actions so much as belongs to external obedience just as the law commands, but not for the law's sake, but by reason of some punishment annexed to it, or out of vain glory; yet he is unjust."

Hobbes's recognition of the imperativeness of the natural, which is also the moral law, is obscured for a hasty reader by the fact that he also repeatedly describes the contents of that law as "theorems" discovered by our reason, like the theorems of mathematics, and even goes so far as to say that these theorems only become *laws* proper in civil society.

Thus (*De Cive*, III, 33) "those which we call the laws of nature (since they are nothing else but certain conclusions, understood by reason, of things to be done and omitted; but a law, to speak properly and accurately, is the speech of him who by right commands somewhat to others to be done or omitted) are, not in propriety of speech laws, as they proceed from nature. Yet, as they are delivered by God in holy Scriptures . . . they are most properly called by the name of laws"; again (*Leviathan*, XV), "these Dictates of Reason, men use to call by the name of Lawes, but improperly: for they are but Conclusions, or Theoremes concerning what conduceth to the conservation and defence of themselves; whereas Law, properly, is the word of him, that by right hath command over others. But yet if we consider the same theoremes, as delivered in the word of God, that by right commandeth all things; then are they properly called Lawes." So in the *Elements of Law* (XV, 2), the "precepts of Natural Law" are said simply to be "those which declare unto us the ways of peace, where the same may be obtained, and of defence where it may not," without any reference to an imperative character, though we read later in the same work (XVIII, 1) that they are "also divine laws in respect of the author thereof, God Almighty." One might, at first, be disposed to understand these deliverances to mean that in themselves the "laws of nature" are mere propositions indicative about the means which are commonly found to be most conducive to a peaceful existence, and that their imperative character as laws, in the proper sense of the word, is entirely secondary; it only arises in a civil society when the sovereign has bestowed it upon them, and reinforced it with penal "sanctions." Thus outside a civil society with penalties for breach of contract, the "law" that "men perform their covenants" would mean merely the proposition that in the vast majority of cases, perhaps in all, a man will find that it pays him better to keep his word than it would do to break it; in civil society, so far as regards contracts of which the law takes cognizance, this statement of fact is converted into an imperative by the sovereign who imports the "thou shalt" into it by making covenant-breaking actionable in his courts. And this is, I believe, how Hobbes has commonly been understood by most of his readers.

But there are, as it seems to me, insuperable difficulties in the way of such an interpretation.

THE ETHICAL DOCTRINE OF HOBBS

(1) It is to be observed that from the first, and even when he is speaking of the condition of things in his imaginary "state of nature," Hobbes always describes the items of the natural law as *dictamina*, or dictates, never as *consilia*, or pieces of advice, and the very use of this language implies their imperative character. ("Dictates," as the inhabitants of many European countries are finding out to their cost to-day, are something very different from counsels or recommendations.) So, too, Hobbes regularly says of his natural law that it is a "theorem" which *forbids* certain actions, and uses imperative or quasi-imperative language in his formulation of them. Thus (*De Cive*, II, 1) the law of nature is defined as "the dictate of right reason, conversant about those things which are either to be done or omitted (*dictamen rectae rationis circa ea, quae agenda vel omittenda sunt*) for the constant preservation of life and members, as much as in us lies." "A Law of Nature (*Leviathan*, XIV) is a Precept, or generall Rule, found out by Reason, by which a man is forbidden to do, that, which is destructive of his life, or taketh away the means of preserving the same; and to omit that, by which he thinketh it may be best preserved." And (*ibid.*) the "Fundamentall Law of Nature" is that "by which men are commanded to endeavour Peace." The imperative character of the law is thus inseparable from it. Even in the "state of nature" the "fundamental law" is not "men cling to life and are reluctant to leave it"; but "I *am* to do what will, so far as I can see, preserve my life, and I *am not* to do what I judge will imperil it." (Suicide would apparently be wholly excluded, even amid all the miseries of the "natural state.")

It is in strict accordance with this recognition of the imperativeness of the law that Hobbes always lays it down that *obligation* is not created by the sovereign when he issues his orders backed by threats of penalties. The moral obligation to obey the natural law is antecedent to the existence of the legislator and the civil society; even in the "state of nature" the law obliges "in foro interno," though not, as Hobbes is careful to add, *always* "in foro externo." This is not a mere idle playing with words. Hobbes could have conveyed his meaning more unambiguously perhaps, if he had laid more stress on the point that the fundamental law of nature and morals, as he conceives it, is a law of *reciprocal* obligation: what it commands is peace with him who is willing also to be at peace with me, "that peace is to be sought after, *where it may be found*," "that every man ought to endeavour Peace, *as farre as* he has hope of obtaining it." The *caveat* that the "Laws of nature oblige *in foro interno* . . . but *in foro externo*, that is, to the putting them in act, not *alwayes*" is, after all, only meant to remind us that the obligations of these laws are reciprocal, and that where there is no common power to

act as protector, a man has to judge for himself whether his desire for peace with me is reciprocated on my part. It has also a fuller implication, which Hobbes's unfriends have not always been fair enough to keep in mind. Whereas the civil law can only be infringed by overt acts or words, the moral law is violated by an improper thought or purpose. "Whatsoever Lawes bind *in foro interno* may be broken, not onely by a fact contrary to the Law, but also by a fact according to it, in case men think it contrary. For though the Action in this case, be according to the Law; yet his Purpose was against the Law, which where the Obligation is *in foro interno* is a breach." (*Leviathan*, XV). "The laws which oblige conscience, may be broken by an act not only contrary to them, but also agreeable with them; if so be that he who does it, be of another opinion. For though the act itself be answerable to the laws, yet his conscience is against them (*De Cive*, III, 28, 7)."

Hobbes is thus quite consistent with himself in maintaining that the natural law—unlike the civil—is "*immutable and eternal*"; what they [the 'laws of nature'] forbid, can never be lawful, what they command can never be unlawful. For *pride, ingratitude, breach of contracts* (or *injury*), *inhumanity*, contumely will never be lawful, nor the contrary virtues to these ever unlawful, as we take them for dispositions of the mind, that is, as they are considered in the court of conscience, where only they oblige and are laws" (*De Cive*, III, 29).

(The meaning of the last clause is only that an outward act which would otherwise have been an exhibition of pride, or a breach of contract, and therefore contrary to the moral law, may acquire a different character, at a particular place and time, owing to the dispositions of the civil law. Thus to exact marks of respect which it would be pride in a private man to demand, may be a proper proceeding on the part of an ambassador or a judge who has the dignity of his sovereign and his sovereign's courts of justice to maintain, and is consistent with the most perfect personal modesty. To desist from fulfilling a contract which the law-courts have pronounced illegal and forbidden me to fulfil is not to show myself a promise-breaker and a man of bad faith, but to prove myself a good citizen; it is my duty as executor under a friend's will *not* to pay legacies which the law has declared invalid, and so on.)

To do full justice to Hobbes we have to remember that the private man in the civil state has other obligations besides that of "keeping his covenant" by obeying all the commands and prohibitions of the civil law. There is a large range of action in respect to which the "sovereign" has not laid down any specific commands, and here, Hobbes holds, I am obliged by the natural law to exhibit the "equity" which he sums up in the traditional maxim not to do to

another what I am unwilling to have done to myself. "Justice" is not the whole of that to which a citizen is obliged only, and quite naturally, in view of the political disorders of the reign of Charles I and the Commonwealth, the practical importance of obedience to constituted authority is so great in Hobbes's eyes that it becomes his predominant theme; it is easy to forget that he equally teaches that we are under an "eternal obligation" to practise an equity which demands mercy, benevolence, gratitude, and to practise it because the law demands it.

Since all obligation, including the obligation to honour my "covenant" by strict obedience to the sovereign, is thus derived by Hobbes from a "natural law" which is the "dictate of reason," he really escapes from the charge brought against him by Cudworth of making moral distinctions the creation of "meer will." It is true that, according to him, there is one distinction which the sovereign does make by his "meer will," that between *just* and *unjust*, *unjust* meaning by definition what the civil law forbids, and *just* what it permits. But the sovereign does *not* in this fashion make the antecedent and more important distinction between *equity* and *iniquity*; his will does not create the iniquity of refusing him the obedience we have promised. And the declaration that he does create the distinction between justice and injustice is, in exposition, so whittled down that it loses a great deal of its apparent sting. Thus we learn that the sovereign does nothing to create the obligation to keep a "covenant"; all that he really does is to decree that the performance of certain "covenants" is illegal, and to prescribe the precise forms of declaration of our intentions which his courts will regard as constituting a contract. So, we are told, he does not make adultery wrong; it was wrong antecedently by the "natural law"; he merely decides "what copulations" are to be regarded as adulterous.¹ I suppose this means that in any case, independently of the authority of any civil law, we could lay it down that sexual connections which are incompatible with the existence of a civilized community are wrong and should be forbidden; but I should be taking too much upon me if I presumed on my own authority to say just what sexual unions are so incompatible; if I am a loyal citizen, I shall regard that as settled for me by the civil law. The law may, of course, make a mistake, exactly as Hobbes himself says, one monarch

¹ E.g. *De Cive*, XIV, 10. "For though the law of nature forbid theft, adultery, etc.; yet if the civil law command us to invade anything, that invasion is not theft, adultery, etc. For when the Lacedaemonians of old permitted their youths, by a certain law, to take away other men's goods, they commanded that these goods should not be accounted other men's, but their own who took them; and therefore such surreptions were no thefts. In like manner, copulations of heathen sexes, according to their laws, were lawful marriages."

may wage an iniquitous war against another. But, as he argues with reference to that illustration, the iniquity of the war is not the guilt of the subject who is commanded to bear arms in it; his business as a good subject is simply to obey the command of his own sovereign, to whom he has "covenanted" to be loyal, and must therefore obey, if he is not to break the command of the natural law that "covenants" are to be kept. He has thus discharged his own conscience; if the command were iniquitous, the iniquity concerns only the sovereign who gave it, and he, according to Hobbes, will have to answer for it to God; if the subject had broken his "covenant" to obey his lawful sovereign on the strength of his personal belief that the command given him was iniquitous, the iniquity of the disobedience would have been with him. This is, of course, just the familiar doctrine, "Theirs not to reason why; Theirs but to do and die," a principle which perhaps few of us would care to apply as unrestrictedly as Hobbes does, but without some recognition of which all transaction of concerted human business would become impossible.¹

It must be remembered, however, that this unqualified submission to the sovereign is regarded by Hobbes not as a mere counsel of safety, but as a strict moral obligation, and that the obligation is imported into it from the "eternal" natural law that faith once given is to be kept, which is antecedent to the creation of political society. His view is not that in civilized societies the natural (or moral) law has been superseded by another, but that, in virtue of his theory of civil society as created by a "covenant" of every member with every other to recognize the sovereign's commands as the rule of life, even when I disapprove of some particular command, I am strictly bound by a "prior obligation," which I cannot violate without bad faith, to comply with it, exactly as a judge is

¹ *De Cive*, XII, 3. "Whatsoever any man doeth against his conscience, is a sin; for he who doth so, contemns the law. But we must distinguish. That is my sin indeed, which committing I do believe to be my sin; but what I believe to be another man's sin, I may sometimes do without any sin of mine. For if I be commanded to do that which is a sin in him who commands me, if I do it, and he that commands me be by right lord over me, I sin not. . . . They who observe not this distinction, will fall into a necessity of sinning, as oft as anything is commanded them which either is, or seems to be unlawful to them; for if they obey, they sin against their conscience; and if they obey not, against right. . . . For by our taking upon us to judge of *good* and *evil*, we are the occasion that as well our obedience, as our disobedience, becomes sin unto us." Clearly Hobbes would have been on the side of those who have regarded Sophocles's Antigone as simply criminal in her defiance of Creon. The doctrine, in its unqualified form, may have its dangers, but in the middle of the seventeenth century many "subjects" needed the warning that the commands of a lawful authority are not to be disobeyed whenever they do not approve themselves to the private judgment of a subordinate.

THE ETHICAL DOCTRINE OF HOBBS

bound by his office to give sentence in accord with the law, even when he personally thinks the existing law a bad one.

If we grant Hobbes's assumptions about the dependence of civil society on the "covenant," and the character of the "covenant" itself, the duty of obeying the civil law, even where I personally think it to be iniquitous, follows as part of a consistent deontology. It is not a logical necessity of the system that we should also accept his egoistic moral psychology. Even if we reject this psychology *in toto*, so long as we grant the premises that civil society rests upon a "covenant" to obey whatever shall be enacted as the "law of the land," and that breach of covenant is always a violation of duty, the conclusion he wishes to draw will follow, viz., that I am only free to be guided by my personal opinion as to what is equity when the civil law has seen fit to leave me free.

(2) The strictly deontological character of Hobbes's thought comes out equally in the doctrine, essential to his argument, that the civil sovereign himself, who obviously cannot be subject to the jurisdiction of his own courts, but has been, in Hobbian language, "authorized" in advance to command and forbid at his own discretion, is just as much under a rigid law of moral obligation as his subjects. He is obliged to equity, the strict observance of the natural (or moral) law, which means, in effect, that he is bound to command and forbid always with a view to the good of the community (and, therefore, as Hobbes is careful to explain, to the practice of just judgment, humanity, mercy, and benevolence). And Hobbes's professed doctrine is that though no human court can take cognizance of the sovereign's shortcomings in this matter, he has always to reckon with the account he will yet have to render to God, who is no acceptor of persons. A hasty reader of the *Leviathan* (though he would be a hasty one) may come away with the impression that Hobbes's sovereign has extensive rights, but nothing to speak of in the way of corresponding duties. The impression should be corrected by a perusal of *De Cive*, XIII, *Concerning the Duties of those who bear Rule*, a chapter of which I would particularly recommend the concluding sections (15-17), which deal with the way in which this duty is violated by "princes" who unduly restrain the "harmless liberty" of the subject by a multiplicity of superfluous laws, allow law to be stultified by the imposition of inadequate penalties or made odious by the infliction of unnecessary severities, or poison its administration by conniving at the corruption of judges by bribes and presents. All such misconduct on the part of "princes" is constantly described by Hobbes as *iniquity* and *sin*.

Now since Hobbes also attempts to reduce all *iniquity* in the end to breach of an express or implied contract, and since he also, as we all know, makes it so capital a point that the parties to the original con-

tract by which civil society was created are not the "sovereign" and the "subject" (who only come into existence in virtue of the contract itself), but the individual items of a "dissolute multitude" which is not yet a society and has no legal personality, we might find a difficulty here. If the original contract, which must not be broken, imposed no conditions of any kind upon the future sovereign's arbitrary exercise of the power to command and forbid, how can he be said to be guilty of *iniquity* if he chooses to issue a host of grandmotherly commands, to enforce them savagely, or to neglect enforcing them, or if he winks at the bribery of his judges? He never covenanted with his subjects that he would not do these things; if he does them, then, he breaks no "covenant," and cannot be iniquitous, if iniquity and breach of contract are the same thing. Hence it is not unnatural that Hobbes should have been suspected of meaning no more by all his talk about the "duties" of sovereigns than that a sovereign who acts in the ways he condemns is likely to draw unpleasant consequences on himself. Yet it is, I think, impossible not to feel that Hobbes is writing in earnest all through the chapter of the *De Cive* which deals with the duties of "them who bear rule," he does mean that in observing the rules he lays down, rulers are only discharging a *debitum*, and Hobbes would have been the first to insist that a man cannot properly be said to owe a debt to himself. It must be remembered that he is always very careful to insist that in ruling with a single eye to the public good, the sovereign is doing what he is *obliged* to do by the "natural law," and that, in his terminology, there is an essential difference between following a *counsel* and obeying a *law*. "*Counsel* is a *precept*, in which the reason of my obeying it is taken from *the thing itself which is advised*; but *command* is a *precept*, in which the cause of my obedience depends on the *will* of the commander. For it is not properly said that *thus I will* and *thus I command*, except the will stand for a reason. Now when obedience is yielded to the laws, not for the thing itself, but by reason of the adviser's will, the law is not a *counsel* but a *command*, and is defined thus: *law is the command of the person, whether man or court, whose precept contains in it the reason of obedience*. . . . *Law* belongs to him who hath power over those whom he adviseth; *counsel* to them who have no power. To follow what is prescribed by *law*, is *duty*; what by *counsel* is *free-will*" (*De Cive*, XIV, 1). If Hobbes had meant, then, that the sovereign who does the various things which he condemns in a sovereign is acting in an *ill-advised* way, doing what he is likely hereafter to be sorry for, and nothing more, he ought, according to his own definitions, to have called the "precepts" of *De Cive*, XIII, simply counsels, not duties. If the ruler can be said to have duties at all, he must be himself subject to a *law* that is to the *command* of some "persons whose precept

THE ETHICAL DOCTRINE OF HOBBS

contains in it the reason of obedience." (Here, again, we may remark an anticipation of Kant, though with a difference. Hobbes means to say that a "counsel" is exactly what Kant calls an *analytic* imperative; it takes the form "do this, if (or since) you desire that, to which this is required as a means." But a dutiful act is one of obedience to a law for which obedience the motive is just that the law is law, is, in fact, in the Kantian not very well-chosen phrase, a *synthetic* imperative.) If Hobbes is to be regarded as consistent with himself we must explain how, on his theory, the sovereign can be guilty of breach of faith, and how this breach of faith can be the violation of a command which is the command of a *person* (in the Hobbian sense), and "contains in it the reason of obedience."

Now as to the first point, there is something to be considered on which Hobbes himself has hardly laid all the stress he should have done. The sovereign, according to him, is created by a voluntary transference to him of what, in the "state of nature," had been the personal right of each of his future subjects. What each of us transferred to the sovereign by this transaction was the right to prescribe at his discretion what we should do and omit. But the purpose of this transference was the promotion of the safety and commodious living of each of us. We did not renounce our claim to this when we renounced our claim to judge of our own discretion how it may be attained. And though the "renunciation" was made not by a contract between the sovereign "of the one part" and the "people" of the other part, but by one between each individual man and every other, in which the sovereign is a beneficiary, but not a party, Hobbes is quite clear on the point that to make the transaction complete there must be an *acceptance* of the proposed transfer of rights by the beneficiary. "In the conveyance of right, the will is requisite not only of him that conveys, but of him also that accepts it. If either be wanting, the right remains" (*De Cive*, II, 5). Hence, though Hobbes does not say much on the point, there is a bargain to which the sovereign *is* a party in the constitution of civil society. He is not a party to the bargain, of which Hobbes speaks in particular, between you and me to divest ourselves of most of our "natural right," he alone has divested himself of none of it. But, as the beneficiary under the bargain, to whom the "rights" you and I lay down are transferred, he *accepts* the transfer, and in accepting it must be supposed to understand and accept the provision that the powers transferred to him are to be exercised for the preservation and commodity of all of us. This does not affect the conclusion Hobbes is most anxious to establish, that you and I cannot equitably cashier the sovereign or call him to account, since we are supposed to have agreed together to authorize beforehand whatever commands the sovereign may, in his arbitrary discretion,

think good to give. We may not rebel because *we* think that what he commands is not conducive to the ends for which the transfer of right was made, since we expressly agreed that *he* was to be the judge of what is so conducive. But it is enough to show that there really is a bargain, to which the sovereign is a party by his acceptance of the sovereignty, that the transferred rights shall be exclusively used in the ways which the sovereign honestly believes to further the end aimed at in the transference, and this is enough to explain why, even on the assumption that all "iniquity" can be reduced to breach of contract—an assumption which Hobbes can hardly be said to carry through with complete success—the sovereign can be said to be capable of "iniquity," to be bound by the natural law, and to have a variety of exacting duties. By accepting the sovereignty he has virtually contracted, not indeed to submit his commands to the judgment of any council or body of ministers, but to use them only as he, in his conscience, deems to be for the common safety and welfare. Hence iniquity on his part, too, though not an offence of which any court can take cognizance, could be brought, at a pinch, without any departure from the main lines of Hobbes's thought, under the head of breach of the great law that "men perform their covenants once made."

(3) There still remains a further point for consideration. Sovereigns, we are told, have duties; a duty means "following what is prescribed by law," and a law is "the command of the person . . . whose precept contains in it the reason of obedience."

If the fulfilling of the law of nature is a duty in the sovereign, it follows that the law of nature is a *command*, and a command the reason for obedience whereto is that it is the precept of a "person" with the *right* to command. What "person," then, is this, whose commands are binding on princes because they are *his* commands? Not the "natural person" of any man, since Hobbes denies the existence of any universal monarch of the earth; not a "court" composed of many "natural persons," since there is no such "court" with jurisdiction over the independent princes of the world. I can only make Hobbes's statements consistent with one another by supposing that he meant quite seriously what he so often says, that the "natural law" is the command of God, and to be obeyed *because* it is God's command. Its clauses are "theorems," because they are discoverable by the unaided use of clear and rational thinking. But if they are also commands, then on Hobbes's principles they are commands laid by one will upon another; no man, as Hobbes puts it, can oblige himself, because, being at once obliger and obliged, he could equally release himself at will from his obligation. "It were merely in vain for a man to be obliged to himself, because he can release himself at his own pleasure, and he that can do this

THE ETHICAL DOCTRINE OF HOBBS

is already actually free" (*De Cive*, VI, 14). "No man can be obliged except it be to another" (*ibid.*, XII, 4). It would seem to follow that the rules of natural "equity" cannot be commands, or laws, and therefore compliance with them a *duty*, so long as we know no more about them than that they are conclusions rightly collected by reason. To recognize them as *laws*, we must also know that they are the commands of God, and since Hobbes teaches that a law which binds *in foro interno* is not really complied with unless there was a formal intention to obey it as law, we do not really fulfil the demands of equity unless we obey the divine command as such, because it is a divine command.

On the question how we know that the "theorems" which figure in Hobbes's text are commands of God, the answer seems to me to vary from one exposition to another. From a passage already quoted from the *Elements of Law* it would look as though the "theorems" obtain this fuller character of being divine laws from their being laid down as commands in Scripture. If that is so, it should consistently be added that they are not laws, but remain simply true "theorems" everywhere outside the "kingdom of God by covenant," i.e. that they are only *laws* to the Jews and Christians who recognize the authority of the Scriptures to which Hobbes appeals. Yet in *De Cive*, XV, 4-5, we meet another different theory. There we are told that God has a two-fold kingdom, "*natural*, in which he reigns by the dictates of right reason; and which is universal over all who acknowledge the divine power by reason of that rational nature which is common to all," and "*prophetical*, in which he rules also by the *word of prophecy*; which is peculiar, because he hath not given positive laws to all men, but to his peculiar people and some certain men elected by him." It is then added that in the *natural* kingdom God's right to rule is founded solely on his *irresistible power*" (whereas in the *prophetical* kingdom, as is explained in detail in the sections of *De Cive* and *Leviathan* devoted to the subject of religion, God's sovereignty over the "elected" rests on a *covenant*). It seems to follow that according to this version of the doctrine, the natural law is a *law* (and not merely a collection of true theorems) for all men except atheists (when Hobbes always regards not as disobedient subjects of God, but as aliens, outside God's kingdom).¹

¹ I confess here to finding a real difficulty in understanding how Hobbes could hold that mere *irresistible power* can be the foundation of a moral *obligation*. In strict consistency, should he not have held that the moral obligation to obey the natural, which is also the divine, law only covers the case of Israelites in the past, and Christians in the present, who are subjects of God in virtue of a "covenant," by which they are pledged to "faith and obedience" (or, when they have erred through frailty, repentance)? As the omnipotent Lord of all things, God is only king over "infidels" in the same sense in which He is king over the beasts whose subjection to his "irresistible power" is not supposed to give rise to any obligations.

PHILOSOPHY

We should, in consistency, have to suppose that the knowledge that the natural law is the command of God may be attained independently of acquaintance with the Jewish and Christian Scriptures. I do not know whether there is any way of reconciling the various passages, nor how, if the view of the *De Cive* is adopted, Hobbes supposes persons unacquainted with the Scriptures to have discovered that the natural law is a command of God. But we are, I think, bound to believe that he means what he says when he calls it such a command; in no other way can we make his explicit statements about the connection between the notions of a *duty*, a *command*, and a *law* inherent with each other. A certain kind of theism is absolutely necessary to make the theory work.

The reasons which used to be given in the nineteenth century for supposing these theistic utterances to be insincere verbiage are really not creditable to the knowledge or intelligence of the writers who used them. In substance they only amount to this, that Hobbes always insists strongly on the incomprehensibility of the divine nature, and on the impossibility of our having a "conception" of God, and that he points out in particular the danger of anthropomorphism attending the ascription of intellect and will to God. (The difficulty is that in us, according to Hobbes, will is *appetite*; the "last appetite in deliberation," and intellection has its beginnings in "sense"; but clearly we cannot ascribe appetite and "sense" to the infinite and irresistible being.) Utterances of this kind are so far from being necessarily expressions of atheism that they are the common stock-in-trade of orthodox Christian scholastics. If Hobbes said that we have no conception of God, it was the universal scholastic doctrine that the *essentia* of God cannot be known to us in this life; though we can answer the question *an sit Deus*, we have to leave the question *quid Deus sit* to be solved in a better world. Neither will nor intellect, nor anything else, according to the greatest of the scholastics, can be *univocally* predicated of God and of any creature. When Hobbes in *De Corpore* threw doubt on the value of philosophic arguments for the beginning of the universe in time, he was only repeating that had long before been more fully urged by St. Thomas. When he says—and the words have actually been used in support of the allegation of "atheism"—that we may only attribute to God two kinds of predicates, negative predicates which deny of Him anything which is a mark of limitation, and superlatives which, by their form, indicate that there is no comparison between Him and the creatures of whom the same epithets are predicated in the positive degree, he is, consciously or not, reproducing the teaching and phraseology of the *de divinis nominibus* of "Dionysius the Areopagite," a writer sympathetically expounded by St. Thomas. Clearly arguments which, if valid, would prove the

THE ETHICAL DOCTRINE OF HOBBS

atheism of most of the schoolmen, including the *Doctor angelicus*, prove nothing about that of Hobbes. On the other hand, he *seems* always to accept at its face value the argument that the universe (= the aggregate of bodies) must have a cause, and since, on his own definition of causation, nothing can be *causa sui*, it follows at once (1) that the "cause of the universe" is neither itself (the "aggregate of bodies") nor any part of itself, and (2) that, if as Hobbes held, nothing can be conceived but body, this cause, though certainly known by the causal argument to exist, must be incomprehensible to us. The internal consistency of this doctrine seems to me to be the best proof that it was sincerely held. (There is, perhaps, a certain inconsistency between Hobbes's definition of cause and effect, for which it should follow that a cause is always temporally prior to its effect, and the doubt expressed in the *De Corpore* about the validity of the reasons given for a beginning of the world in time.¹ But the utmost that this proves, I think, is only that Hobbes had not thought out the implications of the problem to the end. He has been laughed at for leaving the question undecided until it shall be authoritatively determined by the sovereign. But he is here again in the company of St. Thomas. Both leave the last word on the matter to the authorized interpreter of Scripture. The only

¹ The relevant facts are these:—

(1) Hobbes expressly says, here agreeing completely with St. Thomas that no good reasons can be given why the world should have had a beginning (*De Corpore*, IV, 26, 1) (I quote from the text of 1668). *Illos igitur qui mundi originem aliquam fuisse rationibus suis a rebus naturalibus demonstrasse se iactitant laudare non possum. . . . Nonne qui reternitatem mundi sic tollunt, eadem opera etiam mundi conditori aeternitatem tollunt.*

(2) According to the definitions of cause and effect given in the same work (II, 9, 3), a *causa integra* (entire cause) is the "aggregate of all the accidents both of the agents how many soever they be, and of the patient put together; which when they are all supposed to be present (omnibus suppositis) it cannot be understood but that the effect is produced *at the same instant* (quin effectus una sit productus) and if any one of them be wanting, it cannot be understood but that the effect is not produced," and we are consequently told "quo instante causa sit *integra*, eodem quoque effectum esse productum." Thus the "entire cause," including the requisite conditions "is the patient," and the effect are simultaneous. But Hobbes infers from this very proposition the "causation and the production of effects consist in a certain continual progress" (*ibid.*, II, 9, 6), and this seems to imply that the "agent," if not the "patient," also has an existence which is temporally prior to the "effect." If this principle can be extended to the causation of the universe, it would follow that the universe is *not* eternal. I suppose, however, that Hobbes, who held that philosophy is only concerned with those things of which there are "generations," could quite consistently have said that the principle, being a philosophical one, must not be applied to God, nor yet to the "world" if the world is "eternal," and that the question therefore remains open for us as philosophers, though as good subjects we must acquiesce in the sentence of the sovereign, if he thinks fit to pronounce on the matter.

difference between them is that St. Thomas's authorized interpreter is the ecclesiastical power, and it has already given its decision; Hobbes's is the temporal, and its decision cannot be known until the "sword" has finally settled who is to be the temporal sovereign in England.)

The "incomprehensibility" of God, so far from being inconsistent with the thesis that the natural law is a divine command, actually serves to remove a possible objection. If God were comprehensible, it is conceivable that accurate knowledge of His nature might prove that nature to be such that we cannot think of it as the source of commands which oblige mankind. But if the nature of God is an inscrutable mystery, then this very inscrutability makes it impossible to use our inability to understand *how* God commands us as any argument against the fact that He does so command us, provided that the fact appears to be sufficiently authenticated. *If* a man finds evidence for the fact either in the witness of our sense of imperative obligation itself, or in the coincidence of the "theorems" of "right reason" with the injunctions of Scripture, a Hobbit cannot retort on him by alleging, to use the unlovely diction of modern slangishness, that "ultimate reality is unethical," and therefore *cannot* be the source of moral commands and prohibitions. As we simply do not know what the "ultimate reality" is (have no "conception" of it), we are talking idly when we pretend to know that it is "non-ethical."

My own belief, for whatever it may be worth, is that Hobbes simply meant what he said about the natural law as a command of God, and that he was led to this conviction not so much by the Scriptural testimonies which he produces in such profusion, as by the unusual depth of his own sense of moral obligation. The impression repeated study of his works leaves on me is that Hobbes was a fundamentally honest man, and a man, as Professor Laird has said, with an almost overwhelming sense of duty. To such a man the thought that duty is a divine command is so natural that it is almost impossible not to form it. And I conceived that Hobbes's religion—for, in spite of De Quincey's jests, I think it clear he had one—consisted, as Kant's did, almost exclusively in the discharge of the duties of everyday morality with an accompanying sense of their transcendent obligatoriness. It is clear that he was not "religious" in any deeper sense of the word; the worship of the heart was plainly not congenial to him, and his theories, in fact, make any direct personal relation between the worshipper and his god illusory. But such as it was, his religion does impress me as a genuine thing, and it is not very different from that of many worthy persons of to-day who would be sincerely shocked if they were to be accused of "atheism." It seems to me that when we make the

THE ETHICAL DOCTRINE OF HOBBS

necessary allowances for ways of thinking which were current in the middle of the seventeenth century but are now obsolete, Hobbes may have been more in earnest than is usually allowed in supplementing this religion of the duty of a citizen with the one "article of faith" that Jesus is yet to reappear in Palestine and reign endlessly in temporal felicity over resuscitated believers. Such a "faith" would have no chance of being accepted as "the good Christianity" if it were to be proclaimed to-day. But I do not think it impossible that a man living in the welter of conflicting and bitterly hostile creeds of all kinds prevalent in England in the period 1640-50 may have fancied that something of this kind would emerge at last as the simple "substance of the faith."¹

My serious concern, however, is not with what may have been Hobbes's personal opinions on these things, and I only make the remarks of the last paragraph by very free protest against the too facile assumption that there is nothing in the scriptural exegesis with which *Leviathan*, in particular, abounds beyond an ingenious treating of the ecclesiastics with their own weapons. The point I am really anxious to make is that Hobbes's *ethical* theory is commonly misrepresented and unintelligently criticized for want of sufficient recognition that it is, from first to last, a doctrine of *duty*, a strict deontology. It is true that Charles II had the good taste to enjoy the philosopher's conversation, and that the Whitehall of the Restoration is an unlikely quarter in which to find a deontologist. But Hobbes, after all, was not so very often at Whitehall, and he does not belong to the age of the Restoration wits. He is the contemporary of Clarendon, Falkland, and Selden, not of Rochester, Etherege, and Villiers.

¹ I certainly do not myself think that the feats of Biblical interpretation in the *Leviathan* are, in the main, a mere game. Hobbes's exegeses, where they are opposed to those generally current in his time, are often manifestly sound, and even where, to our better informed age they are not sound, they may well have seemed so to their seventeenth-century author. It is only in a small minority of cases that he seems to me to be merely "answering a fool according to his folly." It should always be remembered that Hobbes has an admirable practical purpose in his endeavour to reduce the articles of belief "necessary to salvation" to a minimum. He wants, in an intolerant age, to put an end to persecution for speculative disagreements without challenging the generally accepted view that it is the sovereign's duty to "cause such a doctrine and worship to be taught and practised" as he believes "necessarily conducive to the eternal salvation" of his subjects (*De Cive*, XIII, 5). And he held, as we see from his *Behemoth*, that the ultimate cause of the great rebellion had been the zeal of Presbyterian ministers to enforce all their own personal opinions on points of speculative divinity as "necessary to salvation." Persecution, he thinks, will cease if the sovereign insists on no article as fundamental beyond the recognition of Jesus as the future Messianic king, and the subject understands that conformity to the established worship does not imply speculative agreement in opinion, except on this single point.

N.B.—I have in the text omitted to quote what is perhaps the most important single sentence of Hobbes about *obligation*. In view of its definiteness, I give it both in the Latin and the English forms. *De Cive*, XIV, 2, *annot.*—Clarius ergo hoc dico. Pacto obligari hominem, id est propter promissionem praestare debere. Lege vero obligatum teneri, id est metu poenae quae in Lege constituitur, ad praestationem cogi. *Philosophical Rudiments concerning Government and Society*, XIV, 2.—More clearly, therefore, I say thus: that a man is obliged by his contracts, that is, that he ought to perform for his promise's sake; but that the law ties him being obliged, that is to say, it compels him to make good his promise for fear of the punishment appointed by the law.

The clear distinction thus made between the *obligation* and the subsequent *compulsion* though the "penal sanction" is (a distinction merely overlooked in Bentham's statement that "a Sanction is a source of obligatory powers or motives") explains at once how Hobbes could maintain that the "laws of nature" oblige *in foro interno* even before the creation of civil society, that in civil society they continue to oblige wherever the civil law has issued no injunctions, and that they oblige the sovereign himself, who is inamenable to the civil law. The obligatory force of the civil law itself is, in fact, derived entirely from that of the natural. If we are always to obey the civil law, even when in our private opinion it is inequitable, that is because we are already obliged, in virtue of the natural law itself, to honour our "previous engagement" to be directed by the commands of the sovereign. I am always sure that to break this engagement is inequitable, whereas my personal opinion that the act the sovereign commands me to do is inequitable is, in Hobbes's eyes, never more than a conjecture, and even if I have conjectured rightly, the answerability for the iniquity of the act so commanded lies not with me, but with the sovereign.

OUR EVIDENCE FOR THE EXISTENCE OF OTHER MINDS

PROFESSOR H. H. PRICE

1. IN ordinary life everyone assumes that he has a great deal of knowledge about other minds or persons. This assumption has naturally aroused the curiosity of philosophers; though perhaps they have not been as curious about it as they ought to have been, for they have devoted many volumes to our consciousness of the material world, but very few to our consciousness of one another. It was thought at one time that each of us derives his knowledge of other minds from the observation of other human organisms. I observe (it was said) that there are a number of bodies which resemble my own fairly closely in their shape, size, and manner of movement; I conclude by analogy that each of these bodies is animated by a mind more or less like myself. It was admitted that this argument was not demonstrative. At the best it would only provide evidence for the existence of other minds, not proof; and one's alleged knowledge of other minds would only be at the most well-grounded opinion. It was further admitted, by some philosophers, that our belief in the existence of other minds was probably not *reached* by an argument of this sort, indeed was not reached by an argument at all, but was an uncritical and unquestioning taking-for-granted, a mere piece of primitive credulity; but, it was claimed, the belief can only be justified by an argument of this sort.

This theory, which may be called the Analogical Theory, has come in for a good deal of criticism, and has now been generally abandoned. Perhaps it has sometimes been abandoned for the wrong reasons; for some of its critics (not all) seem to have overlooked the distinction between the genesis of a belief and its justification. However this may be, I shall not discuss the theory any further at present. My aim in this paper is to consider certain other theories which have been or might be suggested in its place, and to develop one of them at some length.

With the abandonment of the Analogical Theory a very different view, which I shall call the Intuitive Theory, came into favour. It was maintained that each of us has a direct and intuitive apprehension of other minds, just as he has of his own, or at least that he intuitively apprehends some other minds on some occasions, for instance in a conversation or a quarrel. It was said that there is social

consciousness as well as self-consciousness, a direct awareness of the "thou" as well as a direct awareness of the "me." I wish to emphasize that this consciousness was held to be a form of knowing, not merely belief (however well-grounded), still less taking for granted. And I think it would have been said to be knowing by acquaintance—extrospective acquaintance as we might call it—though doubtless this acquaintance would make possible a certain amount of "knowledge about," just as when I am acquainted with a noise I may know about the noise that it is shrill or louder than some previous noise.

This view might be worked out in several different ways. Do I have extrospective acquaintance with foreign selves, or only with foreign psychical events, from which foreign selves can somehow be inferred? Or would it be said that foreign selves, and my own self too, are only logical constructions out of extrospectible or introspectible data? Again, is my extrospective acquaintance confined to human minds, or does it extend to sub-human and super-human ones, if such there be? It is certain that some who held this kind of theory thought that it did extend to super-human minds at any rate; for they thought that religious experience, or at any rate one of the types of experience covered by that label, was an extrospective acquaintance with the Divine Mind. And I suppose that some might claim an extrospective acquaintance with what we may call ex-human minds, minds which once animated human bodies, but now animate them no longer (and perhaps with ex-animal minds, if there are any?).

We should also have to ask just what the special circumstances are which make this extrospective acquaintance possible. For clearly it does not occur in all circumstances. Otherwise we shall never be deceived by waxworks; we could tell at a glance whether the man we see lying by the roadside is unconscious, or dead, or only shamming; and we should know at once whether the words we hear are uttered by a gramophone or by an animate and conscious human organism.

I do not propose to pursue these questions any further. I only mention them to suggest that the theory requires a more detailed and thorough working out than it has yet received. But perhaps it is well to add that it derives no support whatever from the phenomena of telepathy. No doubt there is strong empirical evidence for the occurrence of telepathy. But the telepathic relation appears to be causal, not cognitive; it is more like infection than like knowledge. An event E_1 in mind No. 1 causes an event E_2 in mind No. 2, without any discoverable physical intermediary. It may be that E_2 resembles E_1 fairly closely. For instance, E_1 might be the seeing of a certain scene accompanied by a feeling of horror, and E_2 might be the imaging

OUR EVIDENCE FOR THE EXISTENCE OF OTHER MINDS

of a visual image closely resembling that scene, accompanied by a similar feeling of horror. But E_2 is not a *knowing* of E_1 ; just as, when you have scarlet fever and I catch it from you, my fever is not a knowing of yours.

But some advocates of the Intuitive Theory proceeded to take a further step, which we must now consider. We were told, and still are, that the problem before us was mis-stated. We started by assuming that every man has from the first a direct introspective awareness of himself, or of mental events in himself, and the problem was to justify his beliefs concerning other selves. The Analogical Theory said that they were justified by observation of other human bodies. The Intuitive Theory said that they were justified by occasional acts of extrospective acquaintance; or rather it said that some of them are not beliefs, but intuitive knowings, and that the rest (which *are* only beliefs) are justified by the evidence which these occasional extrospective knowings provide. But, it is now suggested, the problem has been stated the wrong way round; we are being puzzled at the wrong things. The really puzzling thing, it is suggested, is *self*-consciousness, not consciousness of other people. What comes first in the historical order is consciousness of one's neighbour, extrospective consciousness. Consciousness of oneself only comes later, after considerable mental development; in some cases perhaps, say in the idiot or the very primitive savage, it never comes at all. Nor is the order merely historical. It is epistemological too. When I do come to know my own mind, I only come to know it by contrast with my neighbours' minds which I have been knowing from the first.

It may, however, be objected that this is only true of attentive and discriminating self-consciousness. Might I not have been *aware* of myself from the first, even though it required time and pain before I attended to this internal datum and discriminated it from other objects of my awareness? To meet this difficulty, the theory is sometimes stated in a still more radical way. It is suggested that the primary thing both in the historical and the epistemological order is a consciousness whose object is not "you" nor "me," but "us." This primitive *we-consciousness* can be called neither introspective nor extrospective, but is that out of which both introspection and extrospection have developed. Each man as he grows up gradually learns to distinguish between different parts of this originally given we-object, and in particular to distinguish between "me," "you," and "the rest." But this achievement, it is suggested, is not an entirely stable one. In times of great emotional stress, as in a battle or a riot, it may break down. One then slips back into the primitive and undiscriminating we-consciousness, and is aware only that "we" are doing or feeling so and so. Such occasions are very rare in the life of the civilized man. But in the very primitive savage it

may well be the other way round. Perhaps he only manages to distinguish between "me" and "you" once or twice in a lifetime.

We have now described several different forms of the Intuitive Theory. They differ as to the relation between introspective acquaintance and extrospective acquaintance, between self-consciousness and social consciousness. But they all have one very important contention in common. They all maintain that there is such an experience as extrospective acquaintance, a direct and intuitive knowing whose object is either another mind, or at any rate an event in or state of another mind. But *does* extrospective acquaintance ever occur? Am I ever acquainted with a feeling of anger or of fear which is not my own? I am sometimes acquainted with my own thinking-processes. Am I ever *acquainted* with thinking-processes which do not occur in myself and have nothing to do with me? It seems to me perfectly clear that the answer to these questions is, No. Of course I am constantly taking for granted the existence of all sorts of foreign emotions and foreign thinking-processes. I take their existence for granted without the least hesitation or doubt. But this is a very different thing indeed from knowing them by acquaintance. If anyone professes that he does sometimes have such extrospective acquaintance with his neighbour's mental processes, I do not see how to refute him. But I can easily conceive both of a strong motive, and of a plausible but inconclusive argument, which might lead him to claim that he had such acquaintance when in fact he had not.

First, the motive. As a distinguished philosopher has said, "we don't want inferred friends." But still, though one does not want them, one may have to put up with them for lack of anything better. Secondly, the argument. It may be urged that unless there is some extrospective acquaintance, the beliefs which each one of us holds concerning other minds could not have the high degree of probability which some of them obviously do have. For where else could the evidence come from which is to give them this high degree of probability? Mere observation of other human organisms, such as the Analogical Theory appeals to, provides but weak evidence, if it provides any at all. One might try to cut the knot by offering a Behaviouristic analysis of statements about other minds, as Logical Positivism did in its wilder youth, on the ground that otherwise these statements would be unverifiable and so nonsensical. If my belief about another mind is really only a belief about the behaviour of a certain human organism, then no doubt I can find abundant evidence to justify it. But then what about statements concerning my own mind? These can be verified or refuted by introspection; so they are *not* to be analysed in a purely Behaviouristic way. But this leaves us with an intolerable asymmetry between

OUR EVIDENCE FOR THE EXISTENCE OF OTHER MINDS

statements about myself and statements about my neighbour. It seems perfectly obvious that words like "hear," "see," "fear," "think," have exactly the same meaning when I apply them to my neighbour as when I apply them to myself. If "*I see a cat*" means simply "this retina here is being stimulated by light-rays and these muscles are adjusting themselves to respond to that stimulus" (e.g. by stroking the cat, or offering it a saucer of milk), well and good; then we may analyse "*Smith sees a cat*" in an analogous way. Only, what is sauce for Smith must be sauce for me as well. The Behaviouristic analysis must apply to both statements alike, or else to neither. But as a matter of fact it seems to me clear that "*I see a cat*" cannot be analysed in this way. However much truth we recognize in the detailed contentions of the Behaviourists—and for my part I am prepared to recognize a great deal—I do not understand how anyone can hold a purely Behaviouristic theory about himself. Much of what we are pleased to call our thinking is doubtless nothing but talking or twitching of throat-muscles, and much of what looks like deliberate action may well be nothing but a complicated chain of conditioned reflexes. But unless I sometimes do think in the literal and non-Behaviouristic sense, how could I discover that at other times my alleged thinking is only talking? How indeed could I *discover* anything at all, or even understand the statements which Behaviourists make to me?

For these reasons it is certainly plausible to argue that unless extrospective acquaintance sometimes occurs, one's beliefs about other minds could not have the high probability which some of them obviously do here. For if extrospective acquaintance be excluded, we must fall back on ordinary perceptual observation. And then it seems we must have recourse either to the Analogical Theory or to Behaviourism, and neither gives us what we want. But I think that this argument, though plausible, is not conclusive. For Behaviourism and the Analogical Theory are perhaps not the only alternatives available. There is at least one other which deserves to be considered, and I propose to devote the rest of this paper to the consideration of it.

2. The suggestion I wish to examine is that one's evidence for the existence of other minds is derived primarily from the understanding of language. I shall use the word "language" in a wide sense, to include not only speech and writing, but also signals such as waving a red flag, and gestures such as beckoning and pointing. One might say, the suggestion is that one's evidence for the existence of other minds comes from *communication*-situations. But this would be question-begging. For communication is by definition a relation between two or more minds. Thus if I have reason to believe that a

PHILOSOPHY

communication is occurring, I must already have reason to believe that a mind other than my own exists. However, it would be true, according to the theory which I am about to consider, that the study of communication is of fundamental importance. For according to it one's most important evidence for the existence of another mind is always also evidence for the occurrence of communication between that mind and oneself. Even so, the word "communication" has to be taken in a wide sense, as the word "language" has to be. Utterances which I am not intended to hear, and writings or signals which I am not intended to see, will have to be counted as communications, provided I do in fact observe and understand them. In other words, we shall have to allow that there is such a thing as involuntary communication.

Let us consider some instances. Suppose I hear a foreign body¹ utter the noises "Look! there is the bus." I understand these noises. That is to say, they have for me a *symbolic* character, and on hearing them I find myself entertaining a certain proposition, or if you like entertaining a certain thought. (It does not matter how they came to have this symbolic character for me. The point is that they do have it now, however they got it.) As yet I only *entertain* what they symbolize, with perhaps some slight inclination towards belief; for as yet I have no decisive ground for either belief or disbelief. However, I now proceed to look round; and sure enough there is the bus, which I had not seen before, and perhaps was not expecting yet. This simple occurrence, of hearing an utterance, understanding it and then verifying it for oneself, provides some evidence that the foreign body which uttered the noises is animated by a mind like one's own. And at the same time it provides evidence that the mind in question is or recently has been in a determinate state. Either it has been itself observing the bus, or it has been observing some other physical object or event from which the advent of the bus could be inferred.

Now suppose that I frequently have experiences of this sort in connection with this particular foreign body. Suppose I am often in its neighbourhood, and it repeatedly produces utterances which I can understand, and which I then proceed to verify for myself. And suppose that this happens in many different kinds of situation. I think that my evidence for believing that this body is animated by a mind like my own would then become very strong. It is true that it will never amount to demonstration. But in the sphere of matters of fact it is a mistake to expect demonstration. We may expect it in the spheres of Pure Mathematics and Formal Logic, but not elsewhere. So much at least we may learn from Hume. If

¹ I use a phrase "a foreign body" to mean "a body other than my own." As we shall see, it need not be a *human* body.

OUR EVIDENCE FOR THE EXISTENCE OF OTHER MINDS

I have no direct extrospective acquaintance with other minds, the most that can be demanded is adequate *evidence* for their existence. If anyone demands *proof* of it his demand is nonsensical, at least if the word "proof" is used in the strict sense which it bears in Pure Mathematics. It is not that the demand unfortunately cannot be fulfilled, owing to the limitations of human knowledge. It is that it cannot really be made at all. The words which purport to formulate it do not really formulate anything.

To return to our argument: the evidence will be strongest where the utterance I hear gives me new information; that is to say, where it symbolizes something which I do *not* already believe, but which I subsequently manage to verify for myself. For if I did already believe it at the time of hearing, I cannot exclude the possibility that it was my own believing which caused the foreign body to utter it. And this might happen even if my own believing were, as we say, "unconscious"; as when I have been believing for many hours that to-day is Saturday, though until this moment I have not thought about the matter. I know by experience that my believings can cause my own body to utter symbolic noises; and for all I can tell they may sometimes cause a foreign body to do the same. Indeed, there is some empirical evidence in favour of this suggestion. The utterances of an entranced medium at a spiritualistic séance do sometimes seem to be caused by the unspoken beliefs of the sitters. That one mind—my own—can animate two or more bodies at the same time is therefore not an absurd hypothesis, but only a queer one. It cannot be ruled out of court *a priori*, but must be refuted by specific empirical evidence.

It might, however, be suggested that we are demanding too much when we require that the foreign utterance should convey new information. Would it not be sufficient if the information, though not new, was, so to speak, *intrusive*—if it broke in upon my train of thought, and had no link, either logical or associative, with what I was thinking a moment before? Thus, suppose that while I am engaged in a mathematical calculation I suddenly hear a foreign body say "to-day is Saturday." I did in a sense believe this already. I have received no new information. Still, the utterance has no logical relevance to the propositions which were occupying my mind, and there was nothing in them to suggest it by association. Would not the hearing of this utterance provide me with evidence for the existence of another mind? I admit that it would, but I think the evidence would be weak. For I know by experience that my powers of concentration are exceedingly limited. Sentences proceeding from my own unconscious sometimes break in upon my train of thought in just this intrusive way. It is true that they usually present themselves to my mind in the form of verbal images. But

PHILOSOPHY

occasionally they are actually uttered in audible whispers, and sometimes they are uttered aloud. How can I tell that these same unconscious processes in myself may not sometimes cause a foreign body to utter such intrusive noises? Their intrusive character is no bar to their unconscious origin. What we require is that they should symbolize something which I did not believe beforehand at all, even unconsciously. It is still better if they symbolize something which I *could* not have believed beforehand because I was not in a position to make the relevant perceptual observations. For instance, I hear a foreign body say "there is a black cloud on the horizon" at a time when my back is turned to the window, and then I turn round and see the cloud for myself. Or I am walking in pitch darkness in a strange house, and hear someone say "there are three steps in front of you," which I had no means of guessing beforehand; and I then verify the proposition for myself by falling down the steps.

3. It follows from what has been said that if there were a foreign body which never uttered anything but platitudes, I should be very doubtful whether it was independently animated, no matter how closely it resembled my own. In the instance given ("to-day is Saturday," when I already believe that to-day *is* Saturday) the platitude was a *singular* platitude, stating a particular matter of fact. But there are also *general* platitudes. Among these some are empirical, such as "there is always a sky above us," "all cats have whiskers"; while others are *a priori*, such as " $2 + 2 = 4$," or "it is either raining or not raining," and are true at all times and in all possible worlds. If there was a body which uttered only singular platitudes, I should be inclined to conclude (as we have said) that it was not independently animated; I should suspect that its noises were caused by my own believings, conscious and unconscious. If it uttered nothing but general platitudes, I might doubt whether it was animated at all. I should be inclined to think that it was a mere mechanism, a sort of talking penny-in-the-slot machine, especially if its repertoire of platitudes was limited; though it might occur to me to wonder whether any intelligent being had constructed it.

So far, then, it appears that if the noises uttered by a foreign body (or its visible gesticulations) are to provide adequately strong evidence for the existence of another mind, they must give me information. They must symbolize something which I did not know or believe beforehand, and which I then proceed to verify for myself. If these conditions are fulfilled, I have evidence of the occurrence of a foreign act of perceiving—an act of perceiving which did not form part of my own mental history. But it is not really necessary

OUR EVIDENCE FOR THE EXISTENCE OF OTHER MINDS

that the information conveyed should be a singular proposition, restricted to one single perceptible situation. It might be general, as if I hear a foreign body say "some cats have no tails," or "all gold dissolves in *aqua regia*." Neither of these is restricted to one single perceptible object or situation. Still, they are both empirical, and there is a sense in which even the second can be empirically verified, or at any rate confirmed, by suitable observations and experiments. Clearly such utterances as these do give me evidence for the existence of another mind; but not in the way that the previous utterances did, such as "there is the bus," or "there is a black cloud on the horizon now." They do not show that a specific perceptual act falling outside my own mental history is now occurring, or has just occurred. In one way they show something less—merely that some perceivings of cats or of gold have occurred at some time or other. But in another way they show something more: namely, that a foreign act of *thinking* is occurring or has recently occurred, directed upon the *universals* "cat," "tail," "gold," and "*aqua regia*." (Or if it be objected that even perceiving involves some thinking, directed upon universals in abstraction from their instances.)

But further, the information I received need not be empirical at all. Suppose I hear a foreign body utter the noises "if 345 is added to 169, the result is 514." I understand these noises, but as yet I neither accept nor reject what they say. For I have never worked out that particular sum before, or if I have, I have forgotten the result. However, I now proceed to work it out, and sure enough the result *is* 514. This, too, gives me evidence of the existence of another mind. But this time I get evidence simply of a foreign act of thinking, and not of any foreign perceptual act at all.

Here, however, we encounter a difficulty. It may be objected that this argument for the existence of another mind is quite different from the one used hitherto, and even inconsistent with it. In the previous cases everything turned on the difference between utterances which give me information and utterances which do not. But a mathematical statement, it is often said, tells me nothing about the world. For it is true whatever state the world may be in. And the like holds of all other *a priori* statements. (Accordingly some philosophers have said that all *a priori* statements are *tautologies*.) If so, how can a mathematical statement be called informative? But if it is not informative, then according to our previous argument the hearing and understanding of it can give us no evidence for the existence of a foreign act of thinking. Indeed, we ourselves gave the utterance " $2 + 2 = 4$ " as an instance of a platitude above.

To this I reply that there is a sense in which many mathematical and other *a priori* statements *are* informative. It is true that they

do not give information about empirical matters of fact, in the way in which such statements as "it is now raining" do, or "some cats have no tails." But they do assert something. They assert certain *entailments* (or necessitations, if you will). And though any entailment, once you have seen it, may be called obvious or evident, it is not on that account necessarily a platitude. The term "platitude" is relative. That which is a platitude to you need not be a platitude to me; and that which is a platitude to me at one time of my life may have been non-platitudinous to me at another. A statement is only a platitude to me when its truth is *already* obvious to me, *before* I hear the statement. If the truth of it was not obvious beforehand, but only becomes so afterwards when I have attended to the meaning of the symbols and to their mode of combination, then it has certainly told me something new which I did not know before. At the time when I heard it, it was certainly not a platitude for me, though it will be one in future if my memory is good. Even " $2 + 2 = 4$," though it is a platitude to me now, perhaps was not always one. When I first heard it, perhaps it told me something new which I had not been able to work out for myself. As Mr. Russell says somewhere, even the Multiplication Table was probably exciting in the time of King Aahmes; for at that time it was not platitudinous to anybody.

It appears, then, that mathematical statements (and likewise other *a priori* statements) can very well be informative, in the sense that they can tell one something which one had not previously found out for oneself; though the something which they tell is an entailment, and not an empirical matter of fact. If it be said that such statements are tautologies, then we must insist that there are novel tautologies as well as stale ones; and the hearing and understanding of a novel one does give strong evidence for the existence of another mind, though the hearing of a stale one gives none or very little.

4. In the situations hitherto mentioned the noises which I hear and understand are uttered by a foreign organism which I observe. And the foreign organism is more or less similar to my own. But of course I need not actually observe it. It suffices if I hear an intelligible and informative utterance proceeding from a megaphone or a telephone, from the next room or from behind my back. It may, however, be thought that such a foreign organism must be in principle observable if I am to have evidence of the existence of another mind, and further that it must be more or less similar to my own organism. But I believe that both of these opinions are mistaken, as I shall now try to show by examples.

There is a passage in the Old Testament which reads, "Thou shalt hear a voice behind thee saying, 'This is the way, walk ye in it.'"

OUR EVIDENCE FOR THE EXISTENCE OF OTHER MINDS

Now suppose that something like this did actually occur. For instance, I am lost on a mountain-top, and I hear a voice saying that on the other side of such-and-such a rock there is a sheep-track which leads down the mountain. After the best search that I can make, I can find no organism from which the voice could have proceeded. However, I go to the rock in question, and I do find a sheep-track which leads me down safely into the valley. Is it not clear that I should then have good evidence of the existence of another kind? The fact that so far as I can discover there was no organism, human or other, from which the voice proceeded makes no difference, provided I hear the noises, understand them, and verify the information which they convey. Now suppose I go up the mountain many times, and each time I hear an intelligible set of noises, conveying information which is new to me and subsequently verified; but I never find an organism from which they could have proceeded, search as I may. I should then have reason for concluding that the place was "haunted" by an unembodied mind. Such things do not happen, no doubt. But still there is no contradiction whatever in supposing them. The point is that if they did happen they would provide perfectly good evidence for the existence of another mind. And this is sufficient to show that the presence of an observable organism is not essential; *a fortiori*, the presence of an observable organism more or less resembling my own is not essential.

Now suppose an even more extravagant case. The clouds might form themselves into Chinese ideographs before my eyes. I might be able to read Chinese, and I might find that these ideographs made up intelligible sentences, conveying new information which I could verify by subsequent observation. Or I might find that they stated a geometrical theorem which I could follow when it was put before me, but could not have discovered for myself. Here, again, I should have good ground for thinking that there was another mind communicating to me. But I could not form the remotest notion of what sort of organism it had; and so far as I could tell, it might have none at all.

In the two cases just considered no body was observed to produce the words, but at least the words themselves were perceived by hearing or sight. But even this is not essential. It might be enough if they presented themselves to me in the form of mental imagery, auditory or visual. Suppose that a sentence came into my mind in this way which conveyed information entirely new to me, information which I could not have inferred from anything I already knew or believed; suppose further that there was nothing in the preceding train of thought to suggest it by association. Then I should be inclined to think that this image-sentence was produced by some unconscious process in myself. The sentence might be "there is

PHILOSOPHY

a wrecked motor car round the next corner." Suppose that on turning the corner I did find a wrecked motor car. I should be somewhat astonished, especially if the sentence had been a long and circumstantial one (mentioning, say, the colour and make of the car, and the number of its number-plate), and was verified in all or most of its details. Still, I should stick to the hypothesis that it was produced by my own unconscious, and should attribute the verification to coincidence. But if such things happened to me several times, it would be reasonable to consider the hypothesis that there was another mind, or several, communicating to me telepathically. And if experiences of this sort went on happening, all giving me new information which was subsequently verified, the evidence might become very strong.

It appears then that I could conceivably get strong evidence of the existence of another mind even if there was no observable organism with which such a mind could be connected. This incidentally is a new and fatal argument against the old Analogical Theory which was referred to at the beginning of this paper. For that theory maintained that one's evidence of the existence of other minds could *only* come from observing foreign bodies which resemble one's own. It is also clear that even when I do observe a foreign body producing the relevant utterances, that body need not be in the least like my own. There is no logical absurdity in the hypothesis of a rational parrot or a rational caterpillar. And if there was such a creature, I could have as good evidence of its rationality as I have in the case of my human neighbours; better evidence indeed than I can have in the case of a human idiot. There is no *a priori* reason why even vegetable organisms should not give evidence of being animated by rational minds, though as it happens they never do. If the rustlings of the leaves of an oak formed intelligible words conveying new information to me, and if gorse-bushes made intelligible gestures, I should have evidence that the oak or the gorse-bush was animated by an intelligence like my own.

Here it may be well to consider the case of parrots more closely, for they appear to cause some difficulty to my thesis. Parrots do make intelligible utterances. But we do not usually think that they are animated by minds like our own; and some even hold that they are not animated at all in the sense in which human bodies are, but are simply behaving organisms which respond in a complicated way to environmental stimuli. It is true that the utterances of parrots do not usually tell us anything new. But it is quite conceivable that they might. Suppose that I do hear a parrot make an utterance which gives me new information. This certainly gives me evidence for the existence of a mind *somewhere*, an intelligent mind like my own. But I should usually assume that the mind in question does

OUR EVIDENCE FOR THE EXISTENCE OF OTHER MINDS

not animate the parrot-organism itself. Why should I assume this? In default of further evidence, it would be quite unreasonable to do so. But, as it happens, I have learned from observation of other parrots that when they make intelligible noises they are not, so to speak, the original sources of these noises, but are merely repeating the utterances which some human body has made in their neighbourhood. Thus, when I receive information from the utterances of *this* parrot, I have reason to think that the mind which is responsible for it does not animate the parrot-body itself, but does (or did) animate some human body in whose neighbourhood the parrot has lived. The case is parallel to that of an echo. An echo coming from a wall might consist of intelligible noises, and they might give me new information. But I should not conclude that the wall was animated by an intelligent mind, because I know that walls do not spontaneously produce noises of that sort, but only *reproduce* noises which are going on in the neighbourhood. The parrot is merely a sort of delayed echo. The like holds for gramophones and telephones, and possibly also for human sleep-walkers.

It must, however, be noticed that my reasons for thinking that these things are *not* animated by intelligent minds are all, so to speak, extraneous reasons, drawn from observations falling outside the situation itself. Suppose one did not have this extraneous information: one might, for instance, be a savage who understood English but had had no previous experience of the behaviour of these particular sorts of objects. It would then be perfectly reasonable to believe that parrots, gramophones, and telephones *are* animated by intelligent minds. For since the noises they utter are *ex hypothesi* intelligible and informative, there is evidence for the existence of an intelligent mind which produced those noises. And as one would then have no evidence for thinking that the production was indirect, it would be perfectly reasonable to conclude that the object from which the noises emanate was itself directly controlled by the mind in question. The conclusion, though reasonable, would of course be mistaken. But perhaps we ourselves are sometimes mistaken in just the same way. For all we can tell, some of the human talkers we meet with may be nothing but living gramophones controlled by minds not their own. Indeed, there is reason to think that something of this kind does happen temporarily in hypnosis.

We have seen that one's evidence of the existence of another mind comes from the receiving of *information* by means of intelligible symbols. In the cases hitherto considered the information turned out to be true, and I discovered this by testing it for myself. But it is not really necessary that it should be true, nor that I should test it. False information is just as good, so long as it *is* information. What is required is that the utterance should convey something

which goes beyond what is already present to my mind, something which I did not consciously think of for myself, and which could not (so far as I can tell) have been presented to me by some process in my own unconscious. A piece of true information which I did not previously possess has this "going beyond" character. But a piece of outrageous fiction may also have it. Of course some fictions are as familiar to me as some truths. These stand on the same footing as platitudes, and the hearing or reading of them gives me no decisive evidence of the existence of another mind. But when I read a novel which I did not write, or hear for the first time a tall story which I did not invent, then I do have good evidence for the occurrence of mental acts not forming part of my own mental history. These foreign mental acts of which I get evidence are primarily acts of thinking. But I can infer that the mind in which they occur must also have had perceptual experiences more or less like my own at some time or other. For one can only make up a fictitious narrative by conceiving of universals, and these must have been abstracted from perceived instances. Or if it be said that there are some universals which are not abstracted from perceived instances, but are known somehow else (innately perhaps?)—viz., such formal or categorical universals as "cause" and "substance"—we may reply that no narrative could consist wholly of these. If it is to be a narrative at all, it must also contain non-categorical universals, such as "cat," "green," "to the right of"; and these at any rate must have been abstracted from perceived instances.

5. I have now tried to show by a number of examples that it is the perceiving and understanding of noises and other symbols which gives one evidence for the existence of other minds. I think it is clear that the situations I have described do provide evidence for this conclusion. But exactly *how* they do so is not yet clear. Before we discuss this question, however, there are three preliminary points to be made.

First, it is necessary to insist that there is nothing recondite about this evidence for the existence of other minds. It is not the sort of evidence which only philosophers or scientists or other experts can discover. Perhaps I have spoken as if it were suddenly presented to the notice of an intelligent and reflective adult, who has reached years of discretion without ever finding any good reasons for believing in the existence of another mind, and now finds some for the first time. But of course this is not really the position. The evidence I have spoken of is available to anyone, however youthful and inexperienced, as soon as he has learned the use of language. All that is required is that he should be able to receive information by means of words or other symbols, and that he should be able to

OUR EVIDENCE FOR THE EXISTENCE OF OTHER MINDS

distinguish between observing something and being told about it. (Perhaps he is not *self*-conscious until he is able to draw this distinction. If so, we may agree with those who say that consciousness of self and consciousness of others come into being simultaneously, though not with their further contention that consciousness of others is a form of acquaintance or intuitive knowledge.) Thus by the time that he has reached years of discretion evidence of the sort described is exceedingly familiar to him, little though he may have reflected upon it.

The second point is more serious. It may be objected that one cannot learn to understand language unless one *already* believes (or knows?) that the noises one hears are produced by a mind other than oneself. For if not, how would it ever occur to one that those queer noises which one hears are symbols at all? Must one not assume from the start that these noises are *intended* to stand for something? Then, but not otherwise, one can proceed to discover what in particular they stand for.

To this I reply, at first it does not occur to one that the noises *are* symbols. One has to discover this for oneself. And one discovers it by learning to *use* them as symbols in one's own thinking. One begins by merely noticing a correlation between a certain type of object and a certain type of noise, as one might notice a correlation between any other two types of entities which are frequently combined, say, thunder and lightning. The correlation is at first far from complete, for one sometimes observes the object without hearing the noise. But gradually one comes to imitate the noise for oneself. And thus the correlation becomes more nearly complete; if no foreign body says "cat" when I see a cat, I shall say "cat" myself. Thus a strong association is set up in my mind between that type of noise and that type of object. The next step after this is certainly a mysterious one, the more so as it is perhaps not literally a "next" step, but merely the continuation and completion of something which has been going on from the start. But the mystery has nothing to do with awareness of other people's intentions. It has to do with what used to be called the abstraction of universals from particulars. We must suppose that all conscious beings have the power of recognizing that two or more particulars are similar to each other. No consciousness devoid of this power would be of the faintest use to its possessor; so it must be assumed that the lower animals, if they are conscious at all, can recognize at least some similarities, namely, those which are important for their biological welfare. But only some conscious beings can single out within the similar particulars that common factor in respect of which they are similar, and can conceive of it in abstraction; that is, at times when they are not actually perceiving or remembering any particular of

the sort in question. This conceiving of universals in the absence of their instances is what we commonly call thinking. And it is for this that symbols are required; conversely, noises and the like only become symbols in so far as they are used as means to such conceiving. For example, I have seen many cats, and for some time I have found that the noise "cat" occurs when I see one (whether it is uttered by a foreign body or by myself, or by both). I must now attend to the common feature of all these objects, and learn to associate the noise with that. Then, when I hear the noise in future, whether uttered by myself or not, it will bring that common feature—that universal—before my mind, even if no cat is actually being perceived by me. When this happens, and not till then, the noise "cat" has become a symbol for me. The process is very puzzling, and I do not profess to have given anything like an adequate account of it. But whatever difficulties there may be about it, it does not seem to presuppose at any stage that one has a prior knowledge of other minds, or even a prior belief in their existence.

Thirdly, a word must be said about so-called Primitive Animism. According to some Anthropologists, primitive men take for granted that all bodies whatever (or at any rate all striking and noticeable ones) are animated by minds; and if this is so, it is plausible to suppose that civilized infants do the same. In that case, have we not stated our problem the wrong way round? The problem will really be "What leads us to believe that most of the bodies in the universe are *not* animated by minds?" rather than "What leads us to believe that certain ones *are* so animated?"

This objection is difficult to discuss because the facts are in dispute. When people say that the savage or the infant is an animist, they seem to be attributing a kind of philosophical theory to him—a set of explicit and formulated beliefs about the universe. But this seems to be an over-rationalization. Beings so primitive and unreflective cannot be accused of subscribing to any kind of "ism." It would be nearer the mark to say that the savage or the infant *acts as if* he thought that most of the bodies he meets with are animated. But I suspect that even this goes too far. All we can be reasonably sure of is that he acts as if he *did not distinguish* between the animate and the inanimate—he speaks angrily to the chair-leg against which he bumps, or tries a stone for murder¹—whereas we ourselves treat the animate in one way and the inanimate in another. If so, the question is this: what evidence has one got that this non-distinguishing treatment, which is observed in savages and infants, is unreasonable; what reason is there for thinking that a human body differs in some very important way from a rock or a tree, or even from a cow? And the evidence is the sort of evidence

¹ This is said to have happened in ancient Athens even in classical times.

OUR EVIDENCE FOR THE EXISTENCE OF OTHER MINDS

already mentioned. Rocks and trees never utter noises which convey information to us, nor make informative gestures, and it is exceedingly doubtful whether cows ever do; but it is certain that human bodies do frequently utter informative noises and make informative gestures.

However, even if it is literally true that savages and infants hold explicit "animistic" beliefs, this need not worry us. It is just a curious psychological fact, if fact it be. It makes no difference to the logic of the matter. For the point is, what *reasons* has one got for believing the proposition that all bodies are animate? And the answer is that in the case of human bodies one has strong reasons, whereas in the case of other bodies one has not. One could perfectly well discover this even though one did *not* start by believing the proposition to begin with, as the "Primitive Animist" is supposed to do. The initial believing, if indeed it occurs, is not a logical presupposition of the discovery. The evidence for a proposition is neither strengthened nor weakened by the fact that I believed the proposition before I began my inquiry.

6. We may now return to the main argument. We have described a number of situations in which the perceiving and understanding of symbols gives one evidence of the existence of another mind. But how exactly do they provide evidence for this conclusion? Let us confine ourselves for simplicity to the cases in which the evidence comes from the hearing of sounds. Two conditions, we have seen, must be fulfilled. The first, and most important, is that they must have a symbolic character. And they must be symbolic *for me*. It is obvious that the characteristic of being symbolic is a relational character. An entity S is only a symbol in so far as it stands for some object—whatever the right analysis of "standing for" may be. It is no less obvious, though sometimes forgotten, that the relation is not a simple two-term relation. It involves at least three terms: the entity S, the object O, and in addition a mind or minds. S symbolizes O *to someone*. The relation is more like "to the right of" than it is like "larger than." A is to the right of B from somewhere, from a certain limited set of places. From other places it is not to the right of B, but to the left of it, or in front of it or behind it.

But if the hearing or seeing of S, or its presentation to me in the form of an image, is to provide me with evidence of the existence of another mind, it is not sufficient that S should symbolize some object to someone. It must symbolize some object *to me*. I myself must understand it. Otherwise all I know about it is that it is a noise or black mark having such-and-such sensible qualities. It is true that if I heard sounds uttered in the Arabic language, which I do not understand, I could reasonably conclude to the existence

of another mind. But only by analogy. The sounds have some similarity to others which *are* symbolic to me; I therefore assume that they, too, might come to be symbolic to me if I took the trouble.

Secondly, it is essential, I think, that the sounds should symbolize to me something *true or false*. They must propound *propositions* to me. It is not, however, necessary that they should have the grammatical form of a statement. A single word may propound a proposition. Thus the word "snake" may be equivalent to "there is a snake in the immediate neighbourhood." Again, the phrase "the bus" may be equivalent to "the bus is now approaching." Must the proposition propounded be such that I can *test* it, whether in fact I do test it or not? It must certainly be such that I know what the world would be like if it were true. Otherwise I have not understood the symbols: for me they are not symbols at all. But it is not necessary that I should be able to discover by direct observation that the world is in fact like that, or is not. Otherwise I could not understand statements about the remote past, whereas actually I can understand them perfectly well.

The third condition is the one which we have already emphasized. The noises must not only be symbolic to me; they must give me information. The proposition which they propound must be new to me. That is, it must be new to me as a whole, though of course its constituents and their mode of combination must be familiar to me; otherwise I do not understand the utterance. If it is not new (i.e. new as a whole) the noises do still give evidence of the occurrence of a mental act other than the present act which understands them, and even of a mental act which is in a sense "foreign." But as we have seen, it might conceivably be an unconscious mental act of my own. And this greatly diminishes the evidential value of the utterance.

Now suppose these conditions are fulfilled. I hear noises which are symbolic to me; they propound to me something true or false; and what they propound is new to me. For instance, I hear the noises "here is a black cat" at a time when I do not myself see the cat and was not expecting it to appear. How exactly does this situation provide me with evidence of the existence of another mind? (It is well to insist once again that evidence, not proof, is all that can be demanded.)

It might be said: I have direct access to a number of cognitive acts by my own introspection. I find that these acts are usually accompanied by noises, audible or imaged. Moreover, I find by introspection that an act directed upon one sort of object, e.g. a cat, is usually accompanied by one sort of noise; and that an act directed upon another sort of object, e.g. blackness, is usually accompanied by another sort of noise. Thus there is a correspondence between

OUR EVIDENCE FOR THE EXISTENCE OF OTHER MINDS

the noises and the acts. Differences in the noises are accompanied by differences in the "direction" of the acts. When the object of the act is complex, I usually find a corresponding complexity in the noise. If n_1 usually accompanies an act directed upon O_1 and n_2 usually accompanies an act directed upon O_2 , then I find that the complex noise n_1n_2 is usually accompanied by an act directed upon the complex object O_1O_2 . And the structure of the complex noise (the way the constituent noises are arranged) varies with the structure of the object-complex upon which the accompanying act is directed. In this way, it may be said, I know from introspection that when the noise-complex "here is a black cat" occurs it is usually accompanied by a specific sort of cognitive act, namely, by the seeing and recognizing of a black cat. But this time it cannot have been a cognitive act of my own, for *I* was not seeing any black cat at the time when the noise-complex occurred. It must therefore have been a foreign cognitive act, an act extraneous to myself, and therefore presumably forming part of the history of some *other* mind.

However, such an account of the matter is not altogether satisfactory. The relation between the noises and the mental acts is really much more intimate than this. It is not a mere accompanying. If it were, the noises would not be functioning as *symbols*. When I am thinking I am always aware of symbols of some sort or another. But they do not just occur along with the thinking. The occurrence of them, whether in a sensible or an imaged form, is an integral part of the thinking itself. One might even define thinking as awareness by means of symbols. Perhaps, indeed, I can *perceive* without symbols. But in fact symbols usually are present to my mind in perceiving as well. And if they are present, again they do not merely accompany the perceiving. They enable me to analyse what I perceive, to recognize and classify the various factors in it, so that the perceiving turns into what philosophers call perceptual judgment, a piece of intelligent or thoughtful perceiving.

Thus the argument should be restated as follows: I know from introspection that noises of this sort frequently function as *instruments* to a certain sort of mental act (not merely accompany it). Therefore they are probably functioning as instruments to an act of that sort in the present case. But in the present case the act is not mine.

But there is still a further amendment to be made. There is a sense in which the noises *are* functioning as symbolic instruments to a mental act of my own. For after all, I do understand them. It is true that I am not seeing the black cat. But I do entertain the thought that a black cat is in the neighbourhood. And I think this *by means of* the noises that I hear. But if the noises are in any case functioning as instruments to a mental act of my own, what need

have I to suppose that there is also some other mental act—some foreign one—to which they are instrumental?

To clear up this point, we must distinguish two different ways in which symbols can be instrumental to cognitive acts. We must distinguish *spontaneous* thinking from *imposed* thinking. In the present case, my entertaining of the thought that there is a black cat in the room is *imposed* by the noises which I hear. What causes me to use these noises as symbols is the noises themselves, or rather my hearing of them. When I hear them, they arouse certain cognitive dispositions in me (dispositions arising from my learning of English, which are there whether I like it or not); and the result is that I am forced to use them for the entertaining of a certain determinate thought, one which but for them I should not on this occasion have entertained.

But how did these noises happen to present themselves to me? I did not originate them, either consciously, or—so far as I can discover—unconsciously either. And how did they happen to be arranged in just that way? They are so arranged that they make up a whole which is for me a single complex symbol, symbolizing something true or false about the world. That is how they manage to impose an act of thought upon me, which many of the noises I hear do not, striking and complicated though they be. How did this remarkable combination of events come about? How is it that each of the noises was for me a symbol, and how is it, moreover, that they were so combined as to make a single complex symbol, symbolizing something true or false? Well, I know from my own experience how it might have happened, because I know what happens in *spontaneous* thinking. In the spontaneous acts of thinking which introspection reveals to me, noises often function as symbolic instruments. And when they do, they are not usually found in isolation. They are ordered into complexes, each of which is symbolic as a whole and signifies something true or false. It would not be correct to say that I find two acts occurring at once: on the one hand, an act of spontaneous thinking, on the other an act of spontaneously producing symbols and ordering them into a symbol-complex which is true or false as a whole. What happens is that the producing of the significant symbol-complex occurs *in the process of performing* the spontaneous act of thinking. Sometimes this spontaneous act of thinking is concerned with something which I am perceiving. It is then a so-called perceptual judgment.

Thus I can now guess how the noises which I hear have come about, and how they have come to be such and so arranged that I am made to use them as instruments for an act of imposed thinking. For I know by introspection that just such noises, and just such an arrangement of them, are often produced in the course of acts of

OUR EVIDENCE FOR THE EXISTENCE OF OTHER MINDS

spontaneous thinking. This makes it likely that here, too, they were produced in the course of an act of spontaneous thinking. But in this case no spontaneous thinking of that particular sort was occurring in myself. Therefore in this case the spontaneous act of thinking must have been a *foreign* act, occurring in some other mind. If the noises are "here is a black cat," the act was probably a perceptual judgment, occasioned by the perceiving of a black cat. But if on investigating the matter for myself I find no black cat, the evidence for a foreign act of thinking still stands. (As we pointed out earlier, false information is just as evidential as true.) Only I shall then have to conclude that this act of thinking was not a perceptual judgment after all, but a piece of fiction-making or story-telling.

In this instance the noise-complex was already familiar to me as a whole. I have often seen black cats and said to myself "here is a black cat." But this is not always so. When I hear a complex noise and find myself using it as an instrument for an act of imposed thinking, it frequently happens that the complex as a whole is one which I am not familiar with. Thus the noise-complex, "the steward of Common-Room keeps a tame mongoose," may be one which I have never myself made use of in an act of spontaneous thinking. Still, if I hear it, it will impose an act of thinking on me; not less so if I am sure that what I am being made to think of is false. And it will accordingly provide me with evidence of a foreign act of spontaneous thinking. This is because I often have used the *constituents* of the noise-complex in the course of my own spontaneous thinkings, for instance the noises "mongoose" and "steward" and "Common-Room." Moreover, although this actual combination of noises is new to me, the *manner* of combination, the structure which the noise-complex has, is perfectly familiar. I have often used it myself in the course of my spontaneous thinkings. Thus the noise-complex as a whole functions as a symbol for me, and imposes an act of thinking on me, even though I have never made use of it in any of my own spontaneous thinkings.

7. We must now raise certain general questions about this argument for the existence of other minds. Though very different in detail from the one used by the old Analogical Theory, it is clearly an argument from analogy. The form of the argument is: situations *a* and *b* resemble each other in respect of a characteristic C_1 ; situation *a* also has the characteristic C_2 ; therefore situation *b* probably has the characteristic C_2 likewise. The noises I am now aware of closely resemble certain ones which I have been aware of before (in technical phraseology, they are *tokens* of the same *type*), and the resemblance covers both their qualities and their manner of combination. Those which I was aware of before functioned as symbols in

acts of spontaneous thinking. Therefore these present ones probably resemble them in that respect too; they too probably function as instruments to an act of spontaneous thinking, which in this case is not my own.

But the argument is not only analogical. The hypothesis which it seeks to establish may also be considered in another way. It provides a simple *explanation* of an otherwise mysterious set of occurrences. It explains the curious fact that certain noises not originated by me nevertheless have for me a symbolic character, and moreover are combined in complexes which are symbolic for me as wholes (i.e. propound propositions). Many varieties of sounds occur in the world, and of these only a relatively small proportion are symbolic for me. Those which are symbolic for me can occur in a variety of combinations, and the number of mathematically possible combinations of them is very large; of these combinations only a small proportion "make sense," that is, result in noise-complexes which are symbolic for me *as wholes*. But if there is another mind which uses the same symbols as I do and combines them according to the same principles, and if this mind has produced these noises in the course of an act of spontaneous thinking: then I can account for the occurrence of these noises, and for the fact that they are combined in one of these mathematically-improbable combinations. When I say that these facts are "explained" or "accounted for" by our hypothesis, I mean that if the hypothesis is true these facts are instances of a rule which is already known to hold good in a large number of instances. The rule is, that symbolically-functioning noises combined in symbolically-functioning combinations are produced in the course of acts of spontaneous thinking; and the instances in which it is already known to hold good have been presented to me by introspection.

It may be objected by some that the hypothesis is worthless because it is *unverifiable*. Accordingly it may be said that it has no explanatory power at all, nor can any argument (analogical or other) do anything to increase its probability. For being unverifiable, it is nonsensical; that is, the words which purport to formulate it do not really formulate anything which could conceivably be true or even false.

Now it is true that the hypothesis of the existence of other minds is "unverifiable" in a very narrow sense of that word, namely, if verifying a proposition entails observing some event or situation which makes it true. I cannot *observe* another mind or its acts—unless extrospective acquaintance is possible, which there is no reason to believe it is. But the hypothesis is a perfectly conceivable one, in the sense that I know very well what the world would have to be like if the hypothesis were true—what sorts of entities there must

OUR EVIDENCE FOR THE EXISTENCE OF OTHER MINDS

be in it, and what sort of events must occur in them. I know from introspection what acts of thinking and perceiving are, and I know what it is for such acts to be combined into the unity of a single mind (however difficult it may be to give a satisfactory philosophical *theory* of such unity). Moreover, the hypothesis *is* verifiable in what is called the "weak" sense. I know what it would be like to find evidence to support it, because I have in fact found a great deal of evidence which does support it; and this evidence can be increased without assignable limit. It seems to me to be a mistake to demand that all the different types of hypothesis should be verifiable in the same manner. What is to be demanded is, first, that the hypothesis should be conceivable (otherwise certainly it is nonsense); and secondly that it should be verifiable or refutable in its own appropriate manner, in accordance with the methods suitable to that particular sort of subject-matter.

However, it is instructive to ask what one would be left with if one refused to entertain the hypothesis of the existence of other minds on the ground of its unverifiability. It would still remain the case that one thinks by means of symbols. Further, the distinction between spontaneous and imposed thinking would still hold good. Nor could one possibly deny that in imposed thinking one acquires information which one did not possess before. It is a rock-bottom fact, and one must accept it whatever philosophy one holds, that the thinking imposed by heard or seen symbols enlarges one's consciousness of the world far beyond the narrow limits to which one's own perception and one's own spontaneous thinking would confine it.¹ An extreme empiricist must accept this fact like anyone else. But the purity of his principles prevents him from attempting any explanation of it, since they force him to conclude that the hypothesis of other minds is nonsensical. So he must just be content to accept the fact itself. Or perhaps he may say: what I *mean* by asserting that there are other minds is simply this fact, that my own consciousness of the world is constantly being enlarged by the hearing of noises and the seeing of marks which are symbolic to me, and by the consequent acts of imposed thinking which go on in me; so that "you" is just a label for certain pieces of information which I get in this fashion, and "Jones" is a label for certain other pieces of information, and so on. In that case he, too, can admit that there are other minds. Indeed, he can say it is a certainty that there are,

¹ Here we may note that even the most rigorous course of Cartesian doubt requires the use of symbols. One cannot doubt without symbols to bring before one's mind the proposition which is to be doubted. And philosophical doubt, which is concerned with complicated and highly abstract matters, is scarcely conceivable without the use of *verbal* symbols. We may conjecture that Descartes himself conducted his doubt in French, with some admixture of Latin.

and not merely (as we have suggested) a hypothesis for which there is strong evidence. But obviously he is giving a very strange sense to the phrase "other minds," a sense utterly different from the one which he gives to the phrase "my own mind."

If I am right, there is no need to go to such lengths. One has evidence of the existence of other minds in the ordinary literal sense of the word "mind," the sense in which one applies the word to oneself. Nevertheless, the argument I have offered does have its sceptical side. Any mind whose existence is to be established by it must be subject to certain restrictive conditions, which follow from the nature of the argument itself. In the first place, it must use symbols which I can understand; and I shall only be able to do this if I am able to use them myself. It is true that I may be able to guess that certain noises or marks are symbolic even if I cannot myself understand them. But this, as we have seen, is because they have a fairly close resemblance to other noises or marks which I do understand. If I never understood *any* of the noises or marks which I hear or see, I should have no evidence for the existence of other minds. (Strictly speaking we ought to add "tactual data" as well. They, too, may be symbols for the person who feels them, as the case of Helen Keller shows.)

There is a second restriction of great importance: any mind whose existence is to be established by an argument must be aware of the same world as I am aware of. It must be such that the world which I am aware of is *public* to me and to it, *common* to both of us. This restriction really follows from the first. Unless the foreign symbols refer to objects which I too am aware of they will not be for me symbols at all. These public entities need not be sense-data. Sense-data might still be private, as many philosophers hold. It might even be, as some hold, that the sense-datum analysis of perception is mistaken from beginning to end, and that sensing is not a cognitive process at all, but is merely the being in a certain state ("seeing blue," or the like). But still, if I am to have evidence of your existence, there must be publicity *somewhere*. Somehow or other we must both have access to one and the same world; if not by sensing, then by some other form of consciousness which sensing makes possible. Suppose this was not so. Suppose that there is another mind which is not aware of the same world which I am aware of, and suppose that it somehow produces noises which I hear or marks which I see. When it makes these noises, obviously I shall not have the faintest idea what it is talking about. How can I, since *ex hypothesi* the noises do not refer to any objects which I am aware of? But this is equivalent to saying that I have no reason whatever for thinking that it is *talking* at all. And so I shall have no reason whatever for believing that it exists, or even for suspecting

OUR EVIDENCE FOR THE EXISTENCE OF OTHER MINDS

that it does. The noises which I hear, even though in fact they state the profoundest truths, will be for me mere noises, like the sighing of the wind or the roaring of waves.

It appears, then, that any evidence which I can have of the existence of another mind must also be evidence that the other mind is aware of the same world as I am aware of myself. Philosophers have sometimes suggested that each mind perhaps lives in a private world of its own. Probably no one believes this. But some people have been worried by the suggestion. They have suspected that though incredible it could not be rationally refuted, and have had recourse to mysterious acts of faith to get them out of their difficulty. But the difficulty does not exist, for this speculation of philosophers is nothing but a baseless fancy. The theory is such that there could not conceivably be any evidence in favour of it. Any relevant evidence one can get is bound from the nature of the case to tell against it. Any evidence that I can get of your existence is bound also to be evidence that you do *not* live in a private world, but in the public world which is common to all intelligences, or at least to all those which can have any good reason to believe in one another's existence.

Another and less welcome restriction which our argument imposes concerns the minds of the lower animals. It is commonly held that the lower animals do not use symbols. Now this may be an overstatement. Possibly some of the higher vertebrates do use them on some occasions. It may be that some of their cries have a symbolic character (though they would be extremely vague and ambiguous symbols), and some of their bodily movements and postures may constitute a crude kind of gesture-language. If this is so, then our evidence for consciousness in them is the same in kind as our evidence for the consciousness of our human neighbours, though it is very much smaller in extent. But there is no reason to suppose that snails and oysters speak, even in the widest sense of the word "speak," or that anyone has ever received information from a caterpillar; not that there is any *a priori* reason why these things should not happen (cf. our remarks on parrots above), but so far as we know they do not. However, these are empirical questions of Natural History, which do not concern me. I only wish to insist that *if* the lower animals do not use symbols—symbols which we can understand and which convey information to us—then our evidence for the existence of animal minds is different in kind, and not merely in degree, from our evidence for the existence of human minds. It can only be evidence of a teleological sort, derived from observation of their bodily behaviour. Much of the behaviour of animal bodies has an apparently purposive character, and suggests that they are moved by wishes and are adapting means to preconceived ends.

But it is not easy to say how strong this evidence is. How are we to distinguish between genuine purposiveness and mere *de facto* conduciveness to certain results, say to the survival of the animal or its species? The movements of the cat in the presence of a mouse are such as to increase the probability that the mouse will be caught. But is there more in the situation than this? Is it at all clear that the cat *wishes* to catch the mouse, and consciously controls its movements in accordance with this wish? Moreover, we find the same appearances of purposiveness in plants. We also find it in all sorts of biological phenomena which no one supposes to be under conscious control: in the anatomical structure of every type of organism, in the mutually co-ordinated growth of its parts, in the circulation of the blood, and in countless other cases. If once we start assuming that wherever there is purposiveness there is mind, we shall end with a most unpalatable and extravagant form of Vitalism; every organism, even the humblest vegetable, will have to be endowed with an intelligence—an intelligence far exceeding our own in its scientific knowledge and its inventive capacity.

I shall not pursue these questions further. Perhaps the difficulties which I have mentioned can be met. I only wished to point out that when communication by means of symbols is lacking, the existence of foreign minds cannot be established in any simple or straightforward way; or if it can, it looks as if the word "mind" would have to be used in a sense somewhat different from that which it has when applied to beings who do communicate by means of symbols. (Cf. the difficulties which arise concerning "unconscious mind" in ourselves.) Thus, when Descartes maintained that human beings are conscious but the lower animals are not, this theory was by no means a foolish one, though it may be mistaken. Certainly there was no logical inconsistency in it. Our reasons for attributing consciousness to other human beings are radically different from our reasons (such as they are) for attributing it to the lower animals. Only he seems to have drawn the line in the wrong place. The line should really be drawn between those beings who use symbols and those who do not. If any animals do use symbols, they come above it; and if any human beings do not, they fall below it, even though they happen to walk on two legs.

8. My argument for the existence of other minds is an argument from language (in a wide sense of that word). It may, however, be objected that I have considered only the *informative* function of language. But of course language is not merely informative. It also has what is called an *emotive* function. This again may be subdivided. In so far as it gives vent to the emotional or conative attitude of the speaker—gives vent to it, not describes it—language may be

OUR EVIDENCE FOR THE EXISTENCE OF OTHER MINDS

called *expressive*. In so far as it is designed to arouse the emotions of others, or to influence their actions, it may be called *evocative*. Now many would hold that in the language of everyday life (and it is this, not the language of science or philosophy, which concerns our present inquiry), the emotive function is quite as important as the informative, or, indeed, much more so. Would it not be very naïve to suppose that the main point of everyday language is to say things which are true or false? The main point of it surely is to express one's emotions and wishes, and to evoke those of others. Is it not this which makes language a *social* instrument? Or rather, since the word "instrument" suggests something which might conceivably be dispensed with and replaced by a substitute, let us say that language is the basis of society—a society is a set of minds which talk to one another. The contention then is that what makes it so is primarily its emotive function. Thus many who would agree that one's evidence for the existence of other minds comes from the perceiving and understanding of symbols would nevertheless complain that I have been approaching the problem from the wrong end. For I have been considering only the informative function of language, whereas according to them it is the emotive function which is of primary importance.

Now, of course, I agree that in any complete account of the nature and function of language great attention must be paid to the emotive side. But I am not concerned in this essay to suggest a theory of language, nor even the barest sketch of one. I am concerned simply with an *epistemological* problem: how the understanding of language gives each of us reason to believe in the existence of other minds. And for this purpose only the informative function of language is relevant. The reason for this is that one's access to another mind is not direct. One gets access to it indirectly by way of the *objects* which the other mind and oneself are aware of in common. If we like to speak of a "social relation" between one mind and another, then my contention is that this relation involves three terms, not two. It involves not merely the two minds, but also some object which they are both aware of. Or again: since I am never directly acquainted with another mind, my evidence for its existence can only be evidence for the existence of something satisfying a certain *description*; and the description must always contain a reference to some object or objects which we are aware of in common.

This primacy of the object is what makes the emotive function of language irrelevant to our present inquiry, however important it may be in other connections. Indeed, it is worse than irrelevant. If we allow it to intrude, we shall be involved in a vicious circle. For one can only understand the emotive aspect of an utterance (in that sense of the word "understand" which is here appropriate)

if one has *already* got reason to think that the utterance was produced by a foreign mind. Once I have found out, by other means, that the foreign mind is there, I can get evidence that it has certain emotions and certain intentions, and I can discover certain rules for correlating these emotions and intentions with certain tones of voice and turns of phrase, as will be explained presently. But the evidence that it *is* there comes from the informative side of its utterances.

For what is the alternative? When people maintain that it is the emotive element in language which gives us our evidence for the existence of other minds, how are they going to work out this suggestion in detail? I think they must say that tone of voice, and likewise bodily bearing and facial conformation, *directly convey* to me the existence of foreign emotions and volitions. It is not enough to say that these features of utterances or of organisms "express" emotions or volitions, though doubtless they do. Your tone of voice may be ever so expressive. But the point is, how am I to *discover* that it is expressive, and what in particular it is expressive of? Why should I not be content to notice that the noise which this body utters has a peculiar raucous quality like the grating of a wheel, or a soft flowing quality like the sound of running water? And these facial grimaces—what makes me think that they are more than curious visible changes, like the flickering of a flame? No doubt these particular qualities of vocal noises do have what one may call a moving character. They give me so to speak a psycho-physical shake; and one may well suppose that the human organism has an innate tendency to be specially moved by them. But the fact that I myself am stirred by hearing a certain noise gives me no ground for inferring that someone else is feeling an emotion. Even if the emotion to which I am stirred happens to be just like the emotion which you felt when you uttered the noise, this does not help. It is not enough that there should in fact be a foreign mental state which my own mental state resembles—if indeed it does. For the question is, how am I to discover that there *is* this foreign mental state? So far this question has not been answered.

I can only think of one way in which it could be answered by those who hold that one's primary evidence for the existence of other minds comes from the emotive element in language. They must have recourse to a theory of "direct conveyance," as suggested above. They must say that the tone of a voice or the momentary configuration of a face enables me to be *directly aware* of the occurrence of a foreign emotion or volition. That is, they will have to hold that the experiencing of such-and-such auditory or visual qualities releases in me a certain cognitive capacity which cannot otherwise be exercised: a capacity for apprehending other minds, or their states,

OUR EVIDENCE FOR THE EXISTENCE OF OTHER MINDS

intuitively and immediately. They smuggle in this direct revelation under cover of the word "expressive," and so make their theory seem less paradoxical than it is. For it is really just a form of the Intuitive Theory, which was discussed earlier in this essay. The contention is that certain auditory or visual experiences—such as the hearing of a raucous tone of voice or the seeing of a facial grimace—enable me to perform an act of *extrospective acquaintance* whose object is a foreign emotion or volition. Perhaps the Intuitive Theory is more plausible in this form than in some others. But it is still open to fatal objections. How is it that I can be deceived by the voice or behaviour of an actor, who expresses emotions which he does not actually feel, or for that matter by ordinary everyday hypocrisy? Might there not be a moving waxwork whose face made lifelike grimaces, and which uttered noises in an angry tone of voice?

It appears then that important as the emotive element in language may be, it cannot provide one with one's evidence for the existence of other minds. But it still remains to ask how one does learn that other minds experience emotions and volitions. The evidence so far considered, derived from the informative side of language, shows only that they are percipients and thinkers. In other words, how does one learn that there *is* an emotive element in most or all of the utterances which one hears and understands, and likewise in writing and gesture?

Let us first consider utterances expressive of volitions. How do I get my evidence that other minds experience volitions? It is because I first get evidence that they are entertaining certain thoughts, and then find that the objective world is being altered in such a way as to conform to those thoughts. For instance, I am seeing a door and I notice that it is open. I then hear the words "that the door has got to be shut." At present, we are assuming, the expressive element in language conveys nothing to me (we are trying to explain by what process it comes to do so). So at present I can make nothing of the words "has got to," nor yet of the determined tone in which they are said. It is just a curious auditory quality which the noises have. But I *can* understand the words "that door" and "be shut," both of which refer to certain objective entities which I am aware of: the one to a certain material thing which I observe, the other to an objective universal which I am familiar with. Thus they bring before my mind *a proposition*, the proposition "the door is shut." Now this is a piece of information. It tells me something new which I did not believe before; I did not believe it before, because I believed the contrary, and indeed I still do. So far, then, I have merely received a piece of false information; still it *is* information, and therefore gives me evidence of the existence of a foreign mind which

is holding a false belief, or at least entertaining a false proposition. But now a curious thing happens. The organism from which the utterance emanated proceeds to move in such a way that the door *is* shut. The situation is so altered that the information which was false before is now made true. Here, then, I have got evidence of the occurrence of a foreign thought which *affects the objective world*. There was a thought with which the objective state of affairs did not correspond; and immediately afterwards the objective state of affairs is altered so that it does correspond with this thought. Apparently this thought has somehow brought about its own verification. It was false when first uttered, but it has altered the situation in such a way as to make itself true.

Normally this alteration comes about by the intermediation of certain movements in the organism from which the utterances proceeded; it gets up and shuts the door. But even if I observed no organism, I could still get evidence of the existence of a foreign volition. Let us reconsider our previous instance of a disembodied voice. Suppose I heard such voice saying, "Let there be a thunderstorm"; and suppose there promptly was a thunderstorm, although hitherto there had been no sign that any such event was likely to happen (the sky, we will assume, was perfectly clear at the moment when the utterance occurred). And suppose that there were many instances of this sort of thing; many occasions when this voice made an utterance conveying a proposition which was false at the time, but was followed by an objective change which verified it—a surprising change, which no previously observable feature in the situation made probable. I should then have good evidence for thinking that the voice proceeded from a foreign thinker whose thoughts could directly alter the objective world. Such "telekinetic" action of unembodied minds does not in fact happen. But there is no logical absurdity in it. And it is no more difficult to understand how a mind can directly cause changes in the atmosphere than to understand how it can directly cause changes in an organism, which after all is only a complex material object.

We now see how one discovers that certain utterances are expressive of volitions. If one is to discover this, the utterance which expresses the volition must also have an *informative* side. It must among other things propound a proposition, one which is at the moment false. I learn that it is expressive of a volition because of the effects by which it is followed. And when I recognize that a sentence is expressive of a volition without actually observing the physical change which fulfils it, I do so by noticing that it resembles other utterances which *have* been observed to have such effects. It resembles them in respect of tone of voice, or in grammatical structure

OUR EVIDENCE FOR THE EXISTENCE OF OTHER MINDS

(by containing verbs in the imperative mood), or in respect of the gestures which accompany it. So I conclude that it, like them, is probably followed by an objective change which verifies it.

Thus it is quite wrong to suppose that the utterance "directly conveys" a foreign volition. There is no question of an immediate and infallible revelation, giving me direct insight into the volition of another person. The "conveying" is a misleading name for an induction which I have to do for myself, by observing that noises uttered in a certain tone of voice are frequently followed by objective changes which verify the propositions they propound.

Let us now turn to utterances expressive of emotion. Emotions are intimately related to thinking on the one hand, to action on the other; and in virtue of these two relations, they are also intimately related to the objective world. Every emotion includes some thinking, and this thinking is not a mere accompaniment, but is an integral part of the emotion itself. The thinking may consist in holding a false belief, as when one is afraid of a purely imaginary danger. But even so, certain objective universals must be present to the mind; else there could be no belief, not even a false one. I may be afraid of a lion outside a door, when in fact there is no lion within miles. But in order to have this "groundless" fear, I must conceive of *lionhood* and *outsideness*. It follows that any utterance which completely expresses an emotion must also propound a proposition, true or false. If someone says in a horror-struck voice, "Oh! a snake!" he is incidentally making a statement which gives me information; the information is, that there is a snake in the immediate neighbourhood. But how do I learn that the tone in which he speaks *is* a tone of horror? I answer, I learn it inductively. I discover by repeated observation that when an object is spoken of in that tone of voice, certain consequences are liable to follow. The objective situation is liable to change in a remarkable manner. The relation between the snake and the organism from which the noise proceeded does not usually remain what it was. The noise-making organism runs away, or strikes the snake with a stick. So when I hear that tone of voice again I conclude that such objective consequences are again likely to occur. We have seen that such utterances do propound propositions, and so give evidence of the occurrence of a foreign thought. But I have now found that when the utterance is in that tone of voice the foreign thought in question is a *tendencious* thought, one which tends to change the objective world in certain ways. And I can correlate differences in tone of voice (and in gesture or facial configuration) with different sorts of objective changes which are liable to follow. Thus I distinguish different sorts of tendencious thoughts, one tending to the avoidance of the object which the thought refers to, another tending to the

PHILOSOPHY

pursuit of it, another to the destruction of it, and so on. And these are the different emotional attitudes.

It follows, and indeed is obvious in any case, that emotional attitudes and volitions are closely connected. Nevertheless, they are not expressed by the same sort of utterance. I discover that an utterance expresses a volition when I find that though false at the moment of its occurrence it results in an objective change which brings the facts into conformity with it. But utterances expressing emotions are related to subsequent objective changes in a more complex way than this. The objective change which follows varies with the specific quality of the utterance. This is not surprising. There is only one way of willing—setting yourself to bring into being the objective situation which you have thought of. But there are many different kinds of emotional attitude; one leads you to alter the objective world in one way, another in another way.

There are, however, certain emotional attitudes which appear not to influence conduct at all, and so do not affect the objective world; for instance, emotions about the past. How am I to discover that an emotion of this sterile kind is occurring in a foreign mind? The utterance which expresses it will indeed propound a proposition to me, and so give me evidence of the occurrence of a foreign thought. But it may seem that in this case the thought has no tendentiousness about it. To this I reply that if the foreign utterance really does express an emotion (and of course hypocrisy is always possible), then the thought of which it gives evidence *is* tendentious, though in rather a different way. Let us consider an emotion directed upon a historical character. Suppose that a man admires the Emperor Valentinian I. If he does, his thinking about that emperor does have effects, effects which it would not have if instead of admiring he disapproved of him. It does not affect the thinker's actions, but it does affect the course of his subsequent thoughts, and this will be revealed by subsequent utterances. We shall find, for instance, that he tends to talk about the good qualities of his hero rather than the bad ones: say, about his military efficiency rather than his atrocious bad temper. If we do not find this, we shall suspect that his utterance did not express emotion at all, but was merely a piece of hypocrisy. Thus in these cases the tendentious character of the thinking lies in the selective control which it exercises upon later thinkings, in directing the thinker's attention upon one set of facts rather than another, and even causing him to ignore certain facts altogether. Thus we may say that in these cases, as in the others, the emotion reveals itself by its tendency to affect one's subsequent relations with objects: only "objects" must be understood to include thinkable objects as well as perceived ones, and "relations" must cover cognitive relations as well as practical ones.

WILL AND ACTION IN ETHICS (II)

PROFESSOR J. L. STOCKS

V

WE may look at the relation of will and motive from another side as follows: Will, we have said, is an individual response to an individual situation. Like the situation itself, it is not a fixed thing persisting through change, but involved in a continuous flow of change, re-adapting itself constantly in one respect or another to recognized changes of circumstance. It can have no more immutability than circumstance, and if it is not to be left behind in the march of events and become old-fashioned, it should have the capacity for the same rapidity of change. Now motives also change, but in a different way. First one motive operates, then another, as circumstance stimulates different inclinations or dispositions: now fear, now curiosity, now love, now hate are aroused separately and together. Thus motives, as influences on action, come and go: but in themselves they seem more stable. Cowardice, avarice, generosity, personal love, and hatred are at least deep-rooted tendencies capable of infinite repetition in action; and it is to such tendencies that we most often appeal in alleging a motive for an action. They are all tendencies to act in certain ways and therefore they are tendencies of will. If an avaricious man is to act generously or a coward to act bravely, we think of him as having first to overcome something in himself which drives him in the contrary direction. There is postulated a discord and rebellion in the will itself, a struggle between two wills—or we may say the will is trying to overcome its own bad habits. Now such tendencies and habits of will are all summed up (and perhaps more besides) in the word character. What the avaricious man or coward has to overcome in such a case is nothing less than his own character. And character is thought of as something capable of change and development indeed, but also as constant and compelling, and often as forming with circumstance the determining cause of human action.

Looked at in this way, motive and character seem to determine action and to deprive the will of power to deal with circumstance as may seem best. Action is determined by will, will is determined by motive, and motive is determined by character. There is thus no power of origination in will—even the growth or development postulated seems to spring only from new circumstances—and as

the man is so will he show himself in action: will is the slave of character.

The only way to freedom suggested is that will, when good, is free from motive. Good action is alone free, since it alone depends on no pre-existing disposition or desire. But what is this way of escape worth if, as we have said, motives are summed up in character? To be free of motive is to be free of character; and the good action which is unmotivated will be characterless. But character is the personality itself, and if character is to go with it will go all opportunity for love or friendship, all humanity even. We therefore have to choose between two horns of a dilemma: either all will is enslaved to character or good action and the good men are colourless abstractions. That is the logical consequence of the doctrine that character in the form of a motive determines the will.

The position just sketched is a familiar one: much plausible but fallacious reasoning has been based upon it: and it is important to determine the outlines of an answer to it. Take first the general proposition that character determines the motive which determines the will. (Co-operation of circumstance of course assumed.)

This doctrine is an expression of our general tendency to explain the present by the past, i.e. of the conception of causation expressed in J. S. Mill's inductive logic by the formula "the cause is the invariable unconditional antecedent." Character is that in which the effects of past actions and circumstances are stored up in the individual ready to be brought to bear on new actions and situations. Through character past action and circumstance determine the response in action to present circumstance. The immediate antecedent which is the cause of action is the motive, but a motive like any other fact of experience has antecedents in past action which account for it.

Much of the apparent strength of the position vanishes if we reflect that motive and character (regarded as the assemblage of possible motives) are not separate and distinct pre-existent entities of which the will shown in the action can be regarded as the consequent effect. It is the character and motive exhibited *in* the act which is judged good or bad and what is exhibited in the act is not strictly speaking the same as anything that existed before the act. If therefore we are to talk of the present as determined by the past, we shall have a present character-motive-act combination determined by a past character-motive-act combination, not a pre-existent character giving birth to a posterior motive, which in its turn gives birth finally to an act. The assertion will be therefore that past character determines present character and past action present action. The only other interpretation would make present character determine present action, but that does not square with a theory

WILL AND ACTION IN ETHICS

of causation which requires the determining cause to be antecedent to its effect. As re-interpreted, then, the doctrine is not that will is enslaved to motive and character, but that will, motive, and character are all alike creatures of the past history of the individual in whom they are seen.

But so interpreted the doctrine ceases to bear upon the relation of motive to will from which we started. It raises instead the metaphysical problems of the relation of present and past and of the freedom of the human will, and the problem of the continuity of human personality through all growth, change, and development. To these problems we must return later: for the present we must confine ourselves to the relation of motive to will.

Avarice, generosity, and other dispositions which serve to supply motives are not to be inferred from a single action. We rely on a series of actions which exhibit a common tendency. The motive specifies directly or indirectly, as we saw, the result to be achieved in action, and in thinking of the motive as repeatable and repeated, we think of a general end which the agent keeps constantly in mind. A man's actions do undoubtedly hang together in some such way as this: the will has a tendency to repeat itself as far as circumstances permit. There is thus good inductive ground for assuming that the will forms habits; and it is as habits of will that avarice, generosity, etc., are best thought of. A tendency to habit means that repetition is easier than variation. If, therefore, there are habits of will, decision in any emergency will not be unbiased: it will be weighted in certain ways: and since such bias is a creation of a man's past history, in this form the past will at least to some extent mould the present. In this form the question of the value of motive again arises. Are such habits conducive to goodness or will? Are they not rather a limitation to its power and range? Mere absence of habits of this kind could not, of course, constitute either goodness or badness of will: but if they exist, they must be of importance, and until we know their value we do not even know what a will really is.

The upshot is that we must for the present qualify our description of the activity of will by recognizing that a man comes to any situation that may confront him not equally free to originate change in every direction: besides the limitations imposed by circumstance there are limitations provided by the lines of habitual response: to some extent, therefore, he comes to any emergency already compromised and committed. The question before us is the question as to the power, value, and extent of these limitations. But we have seen at least this—that it is wrong to think of such habits as limitations imposed by some external entity upon will: they are in will, habits of it: to it, therefore, they should appear (though perhaps they do not always) as freedom not slavery, as choice not as limitations upon

PHILOSOPHY

choice. It is only when we look at the man from without, and ask what prevents him from doing what is obviously demanded by the situation, that we see these habits as limitations and restrictions to the freedom of his choice.

VI

Reflection on these lines inevitably brings us to the notion of virtue. The Stoics, as we have seen, described the moral good as virtue, and the moral bad as vice, and they were criticized by Kant for so doing. It is what the will is, he said, which is judged good and bad: but virtue and vice are properly qualities which the will employs. We have followed Kant in asserting that will alone is good or bad and that will is an individual response to an individual situation. But no philosopher would maintain that virtue was any such response or resolution. Virtue is always considered to be something more than a particular determination of will: it is regarded rather as something behind such determinations, controlling and, as it were, inspiring them, giving some guarantee of the agent's capacity to produce a similar response to any similar situation. Without such a guarantee of repeatability the act is held to fall short of goodness. Aristotle, for instance, realized that the moral good had its being only in action: but he held that mere inspection of the act unsupported by knowledge of the agent's character could not justify the conviction that the moral ideal was achieved in it. It was necessary, he thought, to know not merely that the act was as it should be, but also that it was the manifestation (1) of knowledge, (2) of purpose (disinterested), (3) of a firm and irreversible attitude. The first two requirements may be passed over: they are necessary only because Aristotle here takes action in the external sense (cf. above, § III). When we say the subject of the moral judgment is will, we necessarily make it a judgment upon a purpose or resolution, and a purpose is formed in response to information received and must be judged (as we have seen, § III) in relation to that information. For by knowledge Aristotle means knowledge of the situation—of the circumstances of the act. It is the third requirement which introduces virtue. The externals of an act may be satisfactory, even though by chance or in obedience to command: but in those cases the act is no true act—no evidence of will. But further we are told, even when there is no question of chance-success or external origination, the act may be perfectly adequate and yet imperfect: there may be a tremor and inconstancy in the will which, while not obstructing the *external* perfection, should preclude us from asserting *internal* perfection. The steadfast and constant will is the proof of virtue, and when a man has it he has achieved the moral good. Good actions do not prove a man good, but they go to make him

WILL AND ACTION IN ETHICS

good. For goodness is a habit acquired, like other habits, by practice. If for some length of time we see that our actions conform in every detail we can control to those of goodness, we shall in the end acquire the habit of goodness ourselves. Thus the greatest stress is laid by Aristotle on repeatability as a mark of the completely good act, and virtue (without which the completely good act is impossible) is a habit formed by repetition. As good actions produce good habits, so bad actions produce bad habits: the good habits are virtues and the bad habits are vices. As good acts do not prove a man good, so bad acts do not prove a man bad: before badness is asserted we must be sure of a firmness and constancy of purpose, accompanying the act, which is vice and as it were guarantees repetition.

The influence of this, as of other Aristotelian doctrines, has been enormous: it has moulded the language used on these subjects in modern Europe and still dominates our thought more than we know. It seems commonplace and common sense, because by the time we first meet it face to face we have long been familiar with its terms and features. We find it disappointing like the original picture seen after many years' familiarity with cheap reproductions of it. But in truth it is neither commonplace nor common sense: the doctrine of the *Ethics* is not even reasonably coherent. The emphasis laid on habit seems inconsistent with the autonomy of the will, and the whole doctrine suggests a distribution of moral praise and blame differing considerably from that which is customary in everyday life. The point from which we must approach the doctrine is settled by the preceding discussion. We were inclined to suppose that a habit is a handicap and limitation to will, and that a will which is to show its full power either for good or for evil must be free from such limitations. But we are now told that will, whether for good or evil, finds its realization in something of the nature of habit. Here is a plain contradiction which must be cleared up.

First, about habit. No one, so far as I know, has ever attempted to maintain that the habitual, as such, attracts a higher degree of moral praise or blame than the non-habitual. On the contrary, we are apt to think of the growth of habit as involving in its own region a recession and diminution of will and attention, and an approximation to the automatic which threatens in the end to remove it from the sphere of moral valuations altogether. In other words, we recognize will as the subject of the moral judgment and regard will as antithetic to habit: the more will the less habit and the more habit the less will. It is therefore *prima facie* highly paradoxical to find the moral ideal in the exercise of a kind of habit. When the habit is fully formed, one would think rather that the time for speaking of moral good or evil was past. What is claimed for habit is rather that both directly and indirectly it makes for efficiency.

PHILOSOPHY

Its direct value is seen in all forms of skill. If you think of the process of learning to play an instrument or shoot a gun or take photographs, etc., you see at once how large a part habit plays. Movements which at first needed effort and attention come to achieve themselves automatically and when they reach that stage they are not only more rapid but also more accurate than they were in the early stages. This is the direct value—increased rapidity and accuracy of movement. The indirect value is no less obvious. When attention and effort are no longer required, they are not simply superseded. They are set free for other tasks. We can only attend to one thing at a time; but thanks to habit we can do several quite difficult things at once. The infant requires all its attention for the difficult matter of walking and if it tries to talk as well, probably falls over: but we can walk and talk at the same time without difficulty. An accomplished knitter finds knitting so easy that she can combine knitting with practically any activity which does not require rapid motion or the use of the hands. It would be tedious to multiply instances. Indirectly the value claimed for habit is that it sets the attention free for other things. Under both heads the minimization of will and attention are admitted: these, indeed, constitute the value of habit as an economizer of human effort.

Now assuming that it is will which sets habit in motion—i.e. which *starts* the knitting, walking, etc.—it is obvious that habits of this kind do not diminish but actually increase the range and power of the will. A man with a number of spheres of action firmly held by such habits can do more things more accurately than one who lacks them. The number of possible occupations open to him at any given moment is made larger not smaller by his habits.

That is obviously true in these cases, but a difference and a difficulty is seen when we turn to the habits which are virtues and vices or to those habits which are alleged as motives. These are habits *of* the will itself—i.e. they are comparable not to the automatic action of the hands with the knitting needles or piano notes, but to a habit (e.g.) to knit from five to six or to play the piano from nine to ten. Habits of the last kind obviously do tend to limit the agent's freedom of choice. We must therefore turn to habits of will and consider whether there are such things, what they are, and what their value is (positive or negative) to the human will. Do they make either for efficiency or for goodness?

VII

When it is said that "to form habits is to fail in life" or that "the only habit a child should form is the habit of forming none," it is habits of this last kind which the writers had in view. They think of habit and will as essentially antagonistic, so that a habit of will

WILL AND ACTION IN ETHICS

means an inactivity of will. Will is considered as a capacity of free adaptation to the requirements of life and habit as a tendency to the repetition of the same manœuvre. They recognize in humanity this tendency to stereotyped reactions and regard it as a danger. The man who saves himself from it preserves his powers free and untrammelled. If in a novel situation the old oft-repeated manœuvres failed, the man of habit would be at a loss what to do; but the man of no habits would be free to act as seemed best. The novelty of the emergency would very likely discover gaps in his mechanical equipment, but on the internal side he would be free to improvise and to use what equipment he had to the best advantage. He would combine the freshness and power of youth with the ripe experience of age, and escape the dilemma expressed in the proverb—*si la jeunesse savait, si la vieillesse pouvait*. This view, then, gives as an ideal of efficiency an opportunism which excludes habits of will. To form a habit is to sell your freedom, to forsake the path of improvisation which shows an active will and brings success in life.

Writers, on the other hand, who extol habit and represent it as constitutive of the moral good show a tendency to interpret habit rather in the other way as an acquired skill. But habit, taken in this sense, is not will; it is a gift or talent used by the will; and our moral judgments praise or blame men not for their talents but for their use of them. Habit in this application is not an originator of action: its function is that of so co-ordinating the parts of our procedure that one effort of will will do what twenty did before: it affects the internal machinery of action and makes it doubtless more efficient: but it is thoroughly within the will's control. The skill of the pianist enables him with one glance at a piece of music to execute a whole bar on the instrument, but his playing of the bar is as free and voluntary an act as the blundering piecemeal performance of the novice—more so, in fact, for he succeeds in doing what he intended better than the novice does. Thus the increased range brought by habit in this sense is not purchased at any cost to the originative freedom and adaptability of the will. But such habits, again, are acquired gifts which are employed by will; and the moral good must lie not in the gift but in the will which uses it. If therefore virtue is such a gift, virtue is not the moral good.

From these general considerations it would appear that habit cannot in either use be either wholly or partly identified with the moral good. In the one sense habit is the enemy, in the other the servant, of will. But before registering this conclusion let us consider virtue and the virtues and see how far habit in either sense is involved in them.

If courage is a habit, what kind of a habit is it? Courage requires for its exercise a situation in which a specific element known as

PHILOSOPHY

danger is present: it requires secondly knowledge on the part of the agent of the presence of danger: courageous conduct is that of the man who does what is right in spite of the known presence of danger. Knowledge of danger tends to produce in men a specific emotion, fear: and under the influence of fear a man's first movement is in the direction of diminishing danger by such simple means as running away. But the courageous man does not run away: he may feel the emotion of fear, but he is master of it to the extent of refusing the action to which it prompts: indeed, if right and duty point that way he is seen doing the very opposite, increasing the danger which is the stimulus to fear without giving any sign of wavering in his resolve to do the right. Defined, then, with reference to the situation, courage is right behaviour in face of danger; defined with reference to the emotion, it is a capacity for conquering fear so as to do the very opposite of that which fear prompts. In terms of habit, courage might be called the habit of facing danger or the habit of conquering fear. Its opposite, cowardice, would be the habit of retreat before danger or the habit of being worsted by fear. There is postulated a battle between the will and the emotion. Courage means the customary victory of will, cowardice the customary victory of the emotion.

If, then, other virtues are like courage, virtue is a capacity to persist in a course of action in spite of the presence of a disturbing emotion: the emotion disturbs because it tends to arouse a will to do otherwise: two rival wills (actual or potential) are thus postulated; and the victory over emotion is a victory over a "lower" by a "higher" will. (Cf. §§ IV and V. "Higher" and "lower" are not meant to signify a moral difference or to beg any moral question. The higher will is the more general and permanent responding to a general and comprehensive view of the facts, the lower is the more momentary and transient relevant to a more partial apprehension: the will induced by fear, as we have seen, has reference only to that element in the situation which is called danger.) Virtue, then, might justly be called self-control or strength of will. Further, if virtue is a habit, that can only be because this victory over the lower self or will comes to be achieved more easily and completely with repetition. This, in fact, we are always told is the case, and some writers even point as an ideal to the state in which the disturbing emotions will have no disturbing influence at all. In such a state of complete virtue will, of course, would not be automatic: it would still be necessary, as before, to scan the situation and act carefully with due regard to it and action would involve effort: but the control of the higher over the lower will would be automatic in the sense that the wayward movements of emotion would be stifled at birth with no conscious effort on the part of the agent. He would not be aware of his self-control any more than he is aware of the constant

WILL AND ETHICS IN ACTION

checking of tendencies to overbalance which occurs when a man stands upright.

It is hardly worth while here to test this account of virtue, drawn from the single instance of courage, by an exhaustive examination of other virtues. The traditional list of virtues is a muddle, and it may be doubted whether most of them have any real existence for modern popular thought. Even Plato's cardinal virtues—wisdom, justice, temperance, courage—are hard to co-ordinate under a single notion. Wisdom is at least a bad name for an attribute of will, and Aristotle himself found a difficulty in incorporating justice with the other virtues of character. Justice certainly deserves special treatment. But for our present purpose we may safely assume that courage and temperance are the only two virtues which are of importance, and that if we can bring them together we shall have little difficulty in dealing with other claimants to the name.

Temperance falls fairly easily under the same formula as courage. It is true that there is a *prima facie* difference in the fact that the enemy of temperance is not described as an emotion but as an appetite or desire. We have seen, however, that the disturbing power of emotion rests upon its arousing a will at variance with *the* will; and an appetite or desire is just such a tentative movement of will responding to some easily specified element in the situation, even if its direction is opposite and it is associated rather with pleasure than with pain. Anyhow, it is beyond dispute that in temperance also we find self-control, the victory of the higher over the lower will, the ability to persist in a course of action in spite of inducements to desert it; and here also we are told that practice makes perfect, self-control becoming easier with repetition, and are recommended an ideal of a state in which the tendency to pluck flowers by the wayside shall be so under control that the wayfarer will not be aware of it at all.

Virtue, then, we may conclude, is a habit of control: its enemies are emotion and appetite: it claims the name of habit since it becomes easier and stronger with repetition and because it exhibits that approximation to the automatic which is the mark of habit. It can hardly be doubted that such a habit is a habit of will: but at the same time it is difficult to say that such a habit in any way lessens or restricts that capacity of free adaptation which is asserted to be the essence of will. The habit which is virtue, therefore, does not seem quite to fall into either of our two classes of habit. Courage and temperance are not the servants of will in the sense in which the skill of the pianist is: but neither are they the enemies of will as habits of routine are. It remains to discover their relation to these two classes of habit and their precise value to the efficiency and moral value of the will.¹

¹ Here the manuscript breaks off.

DISCUSSION

SCIENCE AND PSYCHICAL PHENOMENA.¹

MR. TYRRELL'S book is an excellent introduction to Psychical Research by a writer who has himself made an important experimental contribution to one branch of the subject, viz. extra-sensory perception. It is based, so far as the facts are concerned, mainly on the publications of the English Society for Psychical Research, though it also makes some use of materials from American and Continental sources. As Mr. Tyrrell remarks in his *Introduction*, "after fifty-five years of steady work" the S.P.R.'s "*Proceedings and Journal* have grown into a veritable mine of carefully ascertained information. Yet comparatively few people care to read this information or take any interest in its work." The serene indifference or complacent quarter-knowledge with which most philosophers and psychologists dismiss this mass of carefully sifted material, which must (on *any* interpretation of it) be vitally important to their studies, is evidently due to some very strong and deeply rooted non-rational cause. It is to be hoped that Mr. Tyrrell's book will be widely read, and that many of its readers will be stimulated to tackle the original papers and to help in carrying forward research in these subjects.

It is natural to compare Mr. Tyrrell's book with Frank Podmore's *Studies in Psychical Research* and *The Newer Spiritualism*, which are at present the standard introductory works. Podmore's great merit is that he combined an immense amount of first-hand knowledge of the facts with an almost extravagant scepticism about all super-normal inferences from them. Therefore any candid reader feels that he must take very seriously anything that Podmore cannot explain away and a good deal which Podmore can account for only by postulating extremely far-fetched *ad hoc* normal causes. For these reasons I think that Podmore's two books are still indispensable to anyone who is beginning to study the subject. But they have several deficiencies, and Mr. Tyrrell's book supplements them in these respects. In the first place, they date back to the beginning of the century. Since then there have been great advances in normal and abnormal psychology, and a mass of very important ostensibly super-normal material has been added to the subject of Psychical Research. This later material is fully treated in Mr. Tyrrell's book. Secondly, Podmore made no attempt to consider the philosophical bearings of the alleged facts, or to see how they fit or fail to fit into the generally accepted framework of human knowledge and belief. Mr. Tyrrell is, I should judge, less sceptical by nature than was Podmore of the possibility of the super-normal; his own very remarkable experimental results have convinced him (not unreasonably) of the reality of extra-sensory perception, including clairvoyance and pre-cognition; and he has wide philosophical interests and considerable philosophical knowledge. So his book contains an element which is altogether absent from Podmore's.

The book is divided into five Parts, preceded by a short Introduction. Parts I, II, and IV are mainly expository, being designed to give the reader good samples of the evidence for various kinds of ostensibly super-normal phenomena. Parts III and V are primarily interpretative and theoretical, and,

¹ G. N. M. Tyrrell (London: Methuen & Co., 1938. Pp. xvi, 379. Price 12s. 6d.).

DISCUSSION: SCIENCE AND PSYCHICAL PHENOMENA

for that reason, should receive more attention than the others in a review in *Philosophy*. I propose, therefore, to give a brief account of the contents of Parts I, II, and IV, and then to treat Parts III and V in rather more detail.

Part I deals with Spontaneous Extra-sensory Perception. It is divided into four chapters. The first of these defines certain terms which constantly recur in the literature of the subject; discusses the nature and reliability of the evidence for spontaneous (as opposed to experimental) extra-sensory perception; and gives a very brief account of the S.P.R.'s important "Census of Hallucinations." Chapter II gives examples of the evidence for what appears to be spontaneous telepathy between living persons. It includes the famous "Chaffin Will Case" (1925), and a remarkable case connected with the fatal accident to an excursion train at Darlington in June 1928. Chapter III gives examples of the evidence for what seems *prima facie* to be spontaneous clairvoyance. The most interesting case here is taken from Dr. Osty's book *Sur les Connaissances Supranormales*, and concerns the finding of the body of an old French peasant through the clairvoyance of Mme. Morel. Chapter IV gives samples of the evidence for non-inferential knowledge of future and past events and for so-called "psychometry" or "object-reading." Here, again, it is an advantage that Mr. Tyrrell is able to quote quite recent cases from the publications of the S.P.R.

Part II treats of Experimental Extra-sensory Perception. The first chapter gives a short history of the subject. The most important cases mentioned in it are the experiments of Miss Miles and Miss Ramsden in 1905, and those of Mrs. Upton Sinclair in 1928-29 published by her husband in his book *Mental Radio*. The second chapter describes certain collective experiments, done in recent years with large numbers of percipients. Such experiments were tried, and reported in the S.P.R. *Proceedings* by Miss Jephson in 1924; by Miss Jephson, Mr. Soal, and Mr. Besterman; by Dr. Woolley and Sir Oliver Lodge through the B.B.C. in 1927; and by Mr. Soal with certain subjects who were chosen because they had shown *prima facie* signs of supernormal powers in the Broadcasting Experiment. The results of these experiments were negative. Mr. Tyrrell explains this by referring to two facts which, he says, emerge from his own work with individuals, viz. (i) that only a few persons possess the faculty of extra-sensory perception to an appreciable degree, and (ii) that, even with good subjects, this faculty is very liable to be inhibited by psychological resistances. This chapter ends with a description of M. Stefan Ossowiecki's remarkable achievement in describing a drawing presented to him at Warsaw in a carefully sealed light-proof envelope prepared with elaborate precautions by Mr. Besterman at the S.P.R. rooms in London.

The third chapter of Part II gives an account of the much-discussed work done by Dr. J. B. Rhine at Duke University, North Carolina, and sponsored by Professor Macdougall. It is well known that, even after allowing due weight to certain criticisms which have been made by experts on the statistical details of this work, the proportion of successes scored is fantastically above anything that can reasonably be ascribed to chance. Whether it establishes the existence of extra-sensory perception is another question. On this matter the following observations, most of which are based on information that became available after the publication of Mr. Tyrrell's book, may be worth making. (i) I cannot help wondering why the proportion of persons who seem *prima facie* to have marked powers of extra-sensory perception should be so much greater among the students of Duke University, North Carolina, than among otherwise similar persons experimented upon in England. (ii) The S.P.R. have recently been supplied with samples of the kind of cards used in

PHILOSOPHY

these experiments. They are disgracefully badly constructed, and are so defective that in certain sorts of experiment a person familiar with them could sometimes guess the nature of the card from merely seeing the edge of it. (iii) It is quite true that in many of the experiments described by Dr. Rhine this defect would not have helped the percipient in the least. It is also true that the way in which successes tailed off after a time with some of his best percipients does not fit in at all with a normal explanation on these lines. But the facts about the defective cards do produce in my mind an impression of general "sloppiness" which makes me doubt Dr. Rhine's competence to devise properly and describe accurately *any* kind of experiment. This may be most unfair, but, as at present advised, "*ich kann nicht anders.*" (iv) Since Mr. Tyrrell wrote his book a most admirably careful series of experiments, on the same lines as Dr. Rhine's, has been carried out by Mr. Soal, partly on students at Queen Mary College, and partly on the medium Mrs. Garrett who scored an extremely high proportion of successes with Dr. Rhine. In none of Mr. Soal's experiments is there the least trace of any result which cannot reasonably be ascribed to chance. To speak quite frankly, I *know* that Mr. Soal is a highly competent investigator; I have some *prima facie* reason to doubt whether Dr. Rhine is so; and I do not think that any scientist would be prepared to accept as proven in *any* subject a startling claim coming from a youthful American university unless and until it was confirmed by experiments done in older and perhaps more self-critical seats of learning.

In the last chapter of Part II Mr. Tyrrell describes his own very important experiments with Miss Gertrude Johnson, and the extremely ingenious mechanical apparatus which he devised for carrying out a great number of such experiments quickly and for recording the results automatically. I have seen the apparatus, and have been most favourably impressed with it. The positive results which Mr. Tyrrell has obtained are, in my opinion, the most impressive evidence which exists at present for experimental extra-sensory perception. The discussion of certain suggested normal explanations of these results involves some interesting points in the theory of probability and shows how easy it is to fall into traps about "randomness."

Part IV is concerned with Mediumistic Trance. The first chapter begins with a general account of the three varieties which this may take, and then describes and discusses the mediumship of Mrs. Piper, which was studied intensively by Wm. James, Richard Hodgson, Professor Hyslop, and others over a long period of years. There is a masterly paper in Vol. XXIII of the S.P.R. *Proceedings* by Mrs. Sidgwick, entitled *The Psychology of Mrs. Piper's Trance*, and Mr. Tyrrell quotes largely from this. He sums up as follows (p. 178): "The Piper case suggests . . . that in trance-mediumship we are dealing with certain states of consciousness which bear an analogy to hypnosis or auto-hypnosis; that these are full of dream-like associations leading to much nonsensical material; that impersonations of the dead take place, sometimes unconvincingly, sometimes presenting false communicators, sometimes more convincingly; but that behind all this there is evidence of a will to communicate which, when conditions are at their best, gives a strong impression of a genuine deceased communicator somewhere in the background." This seems to me to be an eminently fair summary of the facts.

The second chapter gives an account of the very remarkable "A.V.B." case, which was fully reported by Una Lady Troubridge and Miss Radcliffe Hall, two friends of the ostensible communicator, in Vol. XXX of the S.P.R. *Proceedings*. In this case the trance-medium was Mrs. Osborne Leonard; the ostensible communicator "A.V.B." frequently took control of the medium's

DISCUSSION: SCIENCE AND PSYCHICAL PHENOMENA

organism and spoke with the "direct voice"; and the two sitters seem to have taken all possible precautions against fraud, fishing, and leakage of information by normal means.

The third chapter explains certain attempts which have been made in recent years to devise a system of numerical scoring for the various statements made by a medium in the course of a sitting, so that the amount of correct information actually given may be compared with the amount which might be expected to arise purely by chance. This presents a very difficult problem, both theoretically and practically. A theoretically satisfactory method of combining "marks" has been devised by Mr. Soal and modified by him to meet certain criticisms by Professor Fisher. But there still remains the practical problem of estimating the antecedent probability of individual statements being true by chance. Some attempt to solve this latter problem statistically has been made by Mr. J. G. Pratt, of Duke University.

The fourth chapter contains a sketch of an extremely interesting and original method of research which Mr. Whately Carington devised some years ago and has since been practising and perfecting. It consists of two parts. The first is to apply certain psychological tests, such as the reaction-time test, which Jung devised in order to identify the emotional complexes characteristic of an individual, to a medium (a) in her normal state, (b) when speaking in the person of her habitual "control," and (c) in that much rarer state in which her organism is ostensibly under the direct control of this or that deceased "communicator" who is speaking with the medium's vocal organs. The second part of the method is to subject the quantitative results of these tests to a certain kind of statistical analysis, devised by Professor Fisher and constantly used in other fields of research, known as the "Analysis of Variance." Whately Carington used his method (i) to compare the reactions of the same medium in these various states and when controlled by various ostensible communicators, and (ii) to compare the reactions of different mediums through whom the same ostensible communicator was ostensibly communicating. This was pioneer work, and it is admitted that a great many errors and obscurities occurred in the earlier papers, which the author has gradually removed partly by his own self-criticism and partly through the criticism of expert statisticians. The present situation is admirably stated in an expository and critical paper by Professor Thouless in Vol. XLIV of the S.P.R. *Proceedings*. Mr. Tyrrell quotes largely from this paper, and gives as intelligible account of the method as can be expected in the space at his disposal. It is evident from the discussion in pp. 215-20 of his book that he is not himself inclined to view these quantitative methods very favourably. I do not altogether agree with Mr. Tyrrell's arguments on this point, but I accept his conclusion that "although the quantitative method might in time bring to light useful facts, it would be unsafe in the light of our present knowledge to draw any conclusions from the results, whether they are positive or negative."

The last two chapters of Part IV contain an account of two kinds of test which are of special interest for the following reason. They were not originally designed by the investigators, but were proposed in the course of automatic writing or speech by certain ostensible communicators who claimed to be giving tests of their identity. These are the "Book-tests" and the "Cross-correspondences." The latter, whatever may be the right interpretation of them, are certainly signs of great ingenuity and remarkable knowledge of out-of-the-way literary and classical allusions on the part of *someone* other than the conscious mind of any living person concerned in the experiments. It is extremely difficult to give a satisfactory summary of a cross-correspond-

PHILOSOPHY

ence case. Mr. Tyrrell's account of certain of them, including the "*Thanatos*" case and the very remarkable "Ear of Dionysius" case, should suffice to convince any intelligent reader of the great interest and importance of this kind of evidence. Anyone whose interest is aroused by these samples should read an admirable little book by Mr. H. F. Saltmarsh, which has recently appeared, entitled *Evidence for Personal Survival from Cross-Correspondences*. From this he may pass on to the original reports and critical discussions of them in the S.P.R. *Proceedings* which are listed at the end of Mr. Saltmarsh's book.

Having now given a conspectus of the factual content of Mr. Tyrrell's book, I will conclude by saying something about the more theoretical and speculative portions of it, which are contained in Parts III and V.

Part III is concerned with the Significance of the Evidence for Extra-sensory Perception. In the first chapter of this Part, Mr. Tyrrell is concerned to show that extra-sensory perception, if it exists, "has every appearance of breaking away from the scheme of the world as we at present understand it, and of refusing to fall into line with the causal scheme." He shows, conclusively I think, that explanations of telepathy and even of clairvoyance in terms of the emission and reception of physical radiations are utterly hopeless when we consider them in detail. Hence these kinds of perception, if they exist, must be utterly unlike sense-perception as ordinarily conceived. It is still more obvious that non-inferential pre-cognition, if it occurs, falls altogether outside the range of our habitually accepted axioms and postulates. In this part of his discussion Mr. Tyrrell quotes largely from two papers by the present reviewer, viz. the Presidential Address to the S.P.R. in 1935 on *Normal Cognition, Clairvoyance, and Telepathy* and a paper entitled *Philosophical Implications of Foreknowledge* in Supplementary Volume XVI of the *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*. The latter paper called forth a most interesting critical commentary from Professor H. H. Price, which Mr. Tyrrell here summarizes. He also makes a brief mention of Mr. J. W. Dunne's theory of Time, and gives a more detailed account of an attempt by Mr. Saltmarsh to account for pre-cognition by postulating a greatly extended Specious Present.

In the second chapter Mr. Tyrrell, making great use of Professor Price's book *Perception*, is concerned to stress the following points: (i) That natural science is based entirely upon the deliveries of human sense-perception, and that all its theories in the last resort are concerned with the sensations which would be experienced by normal human beings under conditions which are themselves describable in terms of sensations. (ii) That human sense-perception is not, as it seems to the uncritical experient, an act of directly prehending independent and public things or events. The objects which a human being prehends in sense-perception are private to himself and directly dependent, both for their existence and their sensible qualities, on his own organism and to some extent on his own past experiences and present expectations. Physical things and events are known only as rather remote causal ancestors of certain groups and sequences of characteristically interrelated sensations. (iii) That the axioms, postulates, and procedures of human thinking are themselves limited and conditioned to an unknown extent by the special situation of human beings as living organisms coming at a certain point in a certain line of biological development.

From the first of these contentions it follows that, if there were extra-sensory perception, it would be very unlikely to fit into the existing scheme of natural science. Mr. Tyrrell appears to hold that the resistance to considering seriously the evidence for extra-sensory perception, which is so notice-

DISCUSSION: SCIENCE AND PSYCHICAL PHENOMENA

able among scientists, rests upon a failure to recognize the truth of the second and third of these contentions. (In the third chapter of this Part he gives a very amusing instance of this resistance by quoting from the ludicrously inadequate, ignorant, and supercilious chapter on psychical phenomena which disfigures an otherwise excellent book, viz. *The Science of Life*, by Messrs. H. G. Wells, G. P. Wells, and Julian Huxley.)

In regard to this part of Mr. Tyrrell's book the following remarks seem worth making. (i) In fairness to the scientists (who certainly need all our charity in this matter) it is necessary to stress one point which Mr. Tyrrell rather under-emphasizes. This is the extremely unsatisfactory nature of the evidence, the enormous amount of admitted fraud and self-deception, and the maddening difficulty of reproducing positive results under absolutely satisfactory conditions. When one remembers that at one period this almost made a man so patient, persistent, and fair-minded as Sidgwick abandon the subject in disgust, one can scarcely blame the average scientist for refusing to touch it with a barge-pole. What one *can* blame is his talking dogmatically and pontifically and tendenciously about matters which he has decided (often quite legitimately) not to waste time and temper in studying. (ii) Mr. Tyrrell appears to think that the admission of these three propositions would not only have the negative effect of removing prejudice against the possibility of extra-sensory perception but would also enable us to suggest and test hypotheses about it. I cannot feel very hopeful about this. The difficulties which Mr. Tyrrell has pointed out in conceiving the *modus operandi* of telepathy, of clairvoyance, and still more of precognition, seem to arise from their conflicting with certain fundamental postulates of human *thinking*, in terms of which all causal explanations have to be made. Even if we come to recognize that these postulates are bound up with our special position as biological individuals, I do not see how we are to get outside our intellectual skins and formulate hypotheses in other terms.

Part V, the last section of the book, deals with the Theoretical Aspect of the Mediumistic Trance. It opens with two chapters devoted to the extremely important paper which the present Earl of Balfour contributed to Vol. XLIII of the S.P.R. *Proceedings* under the title of *A Study of the Psychological Aspects of Mrs. Willett's Mediumship*. Mrs. Willett's mediumship, which was studied intensively over a period of twenty years by Lord Balfour, was of a peculiar kind. It was not trance-mediumship in the usual sense. She did not have a certain habitual "control," such as "Feda" in the case of Mrs. Leonard, nor did the ostensible communicators directly control her organs of speech or writing as in the A.V.B. case. The ostensible communicators through Mrs. Willett professed to be Edmund Gurney and F. W. H. Myers, two of the founders of the S.P.R. The former was an intimate friend of Lord Balfour. They claimed to be deliberately training Mrs. Willett for a special kind of mediumship in which the essential point was that she should remain in an almost normal condition and should then, in her own speech or writing, convey to Lord Balfour what the communicators had impressed on her mind. The mere fact that this claim was made and dramatically and consistently maintained throughout a long series of sittings is of the utmost psychological interest, even if we refuse to admit that what was claimed was in any sense true. But the contents of the communications which come through Mrs. Willett are still more interesting. They consist largely of painstaking attempts by the ostensible Gurney and Myers to describe and analyse the processes by which they initiate their communications and by which the medium's mind gradually elaborates them and eventually utters them in speech or writing. The contents of most mediumistic communications are trivial and twaddling

PHILOSOPHY

in the extreme, but the cross-correspondences and the Willett communications are on an altogether different intellectual level. As Mr. Tyrrell quite justly says, "the communicators are strong, intelligent, natural, and give one the impression of being human beings engaged in a difficult task, hampered by certain natural impediments, and explaining their difficulties and what they are doing as they go along." (It may be remarked that a good deal of information purporting to describe the mechanism and the difficulties of communication from the point of view of the "other side" occurs in sittings held by Mr. Drayton Thomas with Mrs. Leonard, in which the ostensible communicators are his father "John" and his sister "Etta." Here again the contents of the communications are intelligible and informative.)

Basing himself mainly on the Willett communications, but also to some extent on those which come through Mrs. Leonard and Mrs. Piper, Mr. Tyrrell reaches the following tentative conclusions. (i) The ideas which finally emerge in the form of automatic speech or writing originate in the depths of the medium's subconsciousness through the exercise of a faculty of "telaesthesia." This is described as a form of extra-sensory cognition in which the trance-personality "reaches out to gather the fact that it needs from wherever the knowledge of it is to be obtained." (I think that "telaesthesia" would stand to "telepathy" in a relation analogous to that in which "listening" stands to "hearing," or "searching" to "seeing," or "exploring tactually" to "passively touching.") (ii) The ideas, thus super-normally acquired, then rise through various levels of the self until they finally "crystallize into the clear-cut discrete ideas with which we do our normal thinking, and in which form alone they can attain verbal expression." (iii) The function of the communicator is "to select and control, guide and shepherd" the telaesthetically acquired material, in such a way that what finally emerges in automatic speech or writing shall convey a certain idea which he wishes to get through to the sitter. (iv) At every stage of this highly complex process there are snags and difficulties, due partly to the associations and resistances of the medium's mind, partly to the very imperfect control which the communicator can exercise over the medium's mind, and partly to the very imperfect knowledge which the communicator has of his own success or failure. (v) The images, sensations, and quasi-sensations which the medium experiences and describes when in trance are created by her own mind, no matter whence the initial stimulus to this process of creation may have come. Items which originate from purely internal sources, and others which are ultimately due to telepathic influences from outside, are inextricably blended with each other. (vi) There is a peculiar kind of experience in which the medium seems to herself to be directly aware of the presence of this or that communicator, to identify him, and to feel in herself certain emotions which she unhesitatingly takes to be *his* emotions at the time. On such occasions she may have no visual, tactual, or auditory images representative of the communicator's body or his gestures or his speech. (vii) Lastly, some of the statements made by Mrs. Willett and other mediums compel us to envisage the possibility of some kind of literal fusion of two persons and literal joint-ownership of certain experiences.

The next chapter, *Trance-Personalities*, and the earlier part of its immediate successor, *Nature of the Communicators*, may be taken together. It is obvious that an habitual control, such as "Feda" in the case of Mrs. Leonard or "Phinuit" in that of Mrs. Piper, bears some likeness to the secondary personalities recognized by students of abnormal psychology. This *prima facie* resemblance is to some extent confirmed by the quantitative results of Mr. Whately Carington's work, which also strongly suggest that there is a profound difference between habitual controls and ostensible communicators,

DISCUSSION: SCIENCE AND PSYCHICAL PHENOMENA

such as "John" and "Etta" in Mr. Drayton Thomas's sittings with Mrs. Leonard. Mr. Tyrrell points out that there are well-known cases of ostensible communicators who show super-normal knowledge and are dramatically self-consistent and yet can be proved to be fictitious. Some very interesting cases of this kind are described by Mr. Soal in his *Report on Some Communications received through Mrs. Blanche Cooper*, published in the *S.P.R. Proceedings*, Vol. XXXV. In some cases the ostensible communicator, who purports to be dead and gives accurate information about events in his life unknown to medium or sitter, is in fact alive and oblivious of what is going on at the sitting. The essential point which emerges from Mr. Tyrrell's discussion of these and other facts may be summarized in his own words as follows: "We must not assume that there are only two alternatives, either (i) that a communicator, substantially the same as the deceased person in question was when alive, is standing at the other end of a psychic telephone, or (ii) that some hypnotic stratum in the medium is playing a part, eked out by telepathy from the living. It is pretty clear that both these theories are too crude and too simple." The alternative which Mr. Tyrrell and certain other highly competent and experienced investigators are inclined to accept is the following. When it appears *prima facie* that a certain deceased person (e.g. Myers) is communicating through a certain medium (e.g. Mrs. Piper) the communications are produced by something which is a compound of two different factors. One of these factors is a certain constellation of the medium's own experiences, traces, dispositions, associations, etc. The other is a factor which is independent of the medium. This may combine on other occasions in a similar way with a certain constellation of experiences, traces, etc., belonging to another medium (e.g. Mrs. Willett), and the compound thus formed may produce communications which appear *prima facie* to come from the same deceased person (e.g. Myers) but are characteristically different in content, emphasis, emotional colouring, etc. Following Mr. Kenneth Richmond, Mr. Tyrrell calls the first factor a "communicator-vehicle" and the second a "communicator-impulse."

Granted that this is the description of the observable facts which seems least inadequate to those who know most about them, it is plain that it immediately leads on to further questions. What is the nature of the "communicator-impulse"? How is it related to the once-living person, Myers or Gurney or "A.V.B.," in whose name the ostensible communications emerge from the medium? Might it not be due to the subconscious activity of some friend of the deceased, still living among us, and unwittingly gaining knowledge by telaesthesia and impressing it telepathically on the medium's mind? Mr. Tyrrell considers such questions as these, and certain suggested answers to them in Chapter XXI of his book.

Mr. Tyrrell first states and discusses a form of the Compound theory which was tentatively suggested some years ago by the present reviewer in *The Mind and its Place in Nature* as a minimal hypothesis to cover most, but not all, of the well-established facts of trance-mediumship. His objections are as follows: (i) He thinks that, if this theory were true, the most impressive and characteristic communications might be expected to occur in those cases where the ostensible communicator is ostensibly in direct control of the medium's organism. But in fact, he alleges, this is not so. The most impressive and characteristic communications occur in connection with Mrs. Willett's peculiar kind of mediumship, which does not fit at all easily into the theory under consideration. (ii) It is admitted that the theory has to be eked out by the hypothesis of elaborate telepathic action from certain living persons on the mind of the medium. If this can do as much as is required of it, it can

PHILOSOPHY

do enough to make the postulate of a persistent "psycho-genic factor" (which is the essential feature of the theory) superfluous.

Mr. Tyrrell then considers whether telepathy from the living will suffice to account for the facts. In the cross-correspondence cases it is generally admitted that Mrs. Verrall, and she alone, of the automatic writers concerned, had the necessary classical knowledge. If any living mind was responsible, Mrs. Verrall's was much the most likely candidate. But, in the first place, the cross-correspondences continued to go on in the same dramatic form and with the same ostensible communicators after her death in 1916. Secondly, we should have to suppose that some stratum of Mrs. Verrall's subconscious self not only telepathically conveyed to the various automatists concerned the various items of information which were to emerge in a cross-correspondence, but also telepathically induced these automatists to dramatize their utterances in such a way that they appeared to be characteristic of certain deceased persons, such as Myers and Gurney. Lastly, in the case of a medium like Mrs. Leonard large numbers of highly characteristic dramatizations of deceased persons whom she has never met have been produced in presence of various sitters. Some of these have been strikingly life-like from the very first. If we ascribe this to telepathy from the sitter, we must suppose that he not only has somewhere in his mind a "model" of the characteristic traits of his deceased friends, but that he can somehow induce the medium to act and talk in imitation of this "model" which she has never seen in the flesh. If we are going to call this "telepathy," we ought to realize that it is something enormously different from the spontaneous and experimental extra-sensory perception which was discussed earlier in the book.

Mr. Tyrrell reverts to the telepathic theory in the last chapter of his book, and gives an excellent summary of his objections to it. I will quote what seems to me to be a very fair commentary of his on the telepathic theory. "In order to make it work we have to regard the living mind as something different from and immensely wider than what we commonly mean by the term, and we have to endow it with such a range of 'subliminal self' and with such astonishing extra-sensory powers that the proposition of its survival takes on a new aspect."

In the latter part of Chapter XXI Mr. Tyrrell discusses certain arguments against the antecedent probability of human survival which have been put forward by Professor Richet; and certain other arguments, which seem to me to be much more impressive, enunciated by Professor Dodds in his paper *Why I Do Not Believe in Survival* in S.P.R. *Proceedings*, Vol. XLII. (It should be noted that both these writers are thoroughly familiar with the facts of psychical research, and that both accept the existence of various forms of extra-sensory perception.) The gist of Mr. Tyrrell's answer appears to be that both writers take far too narrow and conventional view about the nature and limitations of the embodied self and about what survival would be if it were a fact. Psycho-analysis and abnormal psychology suffice to show that the ordinary embodied self is a far more complex entity than it appears to superficial observation confined to the normal waking life of persons in good mental health. The occurrence of extra-sensory perception and trance-mediumship reveal further depths beneath those which are plumbed by the psycho-analyst and the abnormal psychologist. And the occurrence of pre-cognition shows that our everyday notions of time are so inadequate that it is unsafe to regard mere continuance of a self's earthly life as the only possible form that survival could take.

Mr. Tyrrell's own view about survival is stated very tentatively in the last chapter of the book (pp. 368-9). I do not think that I understand it well

DISCUSSION: SCIENCE AND PSYCHICAL PHENOMENA

enough to be able to give a useful summary of it. It involves the notion of a "self-principle" or "I-principle." This is said to have "animated" the deceased person when he was still alive in the body; to persist after the death of the latter; and to "animate" a new personality, which "becomes deranged in the process of helping to form the trance-personality" (during mediumistic communications) "and harks back to something more or less resembling its former terrestrial self, and, while doing so, may even forget a good deal about its other-worldly state of existence."

It remains for me to remark that Mr. Tyrrell devotes to the physical phenomena of mediumship a chapter which is short but is quite as long as the utterly unsatisfactory state of the available evidence warrants. He also discusses, briefly and sensibly, in two successive chapters, the relation of psychical research to Spiritualism and to Religion.

I have noted a good many typographical errors, and I hope that Mr. Tyrrell's book will soon go into a second impression which will give him an opportunity to correct them. On p. 42, l. 4, for *he* read *him*; on p. 114, l. 15, for *Case 17* read *Case 13*, and in the next line for *Lady Z* read *Lady Q*; on p. 125, l. 11, I think that *less* must be a mistake for *greater*; on p. 213, l. 23, for *imposter* read *impostor*; on p. 241, l. 8, for *Aristophenes* read *Aristophanes*; on p. 306, l. 33, for *analogous* read *analogous*. There are probably other small misprints which I have overlooked.

C. D. BROAD.

PHILOSOPHICAL SURVEY

PHILOSOPHY IN ITALY.

BENEDETTO CROCE'S book on history¹ is the ideal continuation of his earlier book published over a score of years ago on "La Teoria e Storia della storiografia" forming the final part of the "Filosofia dello spirito." During this long period Croce has had the opportunity to enrich and extend his historiographical experiences with a series of volumes, of which those on the History of Naples, the History of Italy, and the History of Europe in the Nineteenth Century are the most important and have had the widest repercussions. In all this range of experience his fundamental theses on the character and value of history have not been substantially altered. They have actually developed in breadth and depth, so that in the present volume we find them with their characteristic lineaments, old and new together, rendered fuller and more vivid by the rich lymph of the concrete problems of historical life by which they are nourished. In the meantime a series of violent and tumultuous changes, provoking vehement opposing mental reactions, has brought into discussion grave doubts, raised on certain points which first appeared firmly established in the historical view of the world. The antithesis has moved Croce to reaffirm his thought with renewed polemic ardour, thereby throwing it into stronger relief, and giving it a greater sense of reality.

Croce's philosophy is well known to be definitely historical in colouring—he identifies the entire life of the spirit with history and human intelligence with historiography. Philosophy itself is hereby resolved into a methodological energy of history, into a study of the categories of historical criticism, and loses all *raison d'être* as a higher and clearer intelligence. Many weighty critical arguments have been advanced against the consequences, part implicit, part explicit, of this doctrine. Mutually self-supporting, and concurring in a single aim, they have taken shape under a common anti-historicist banner. Where, it has been said, is the supposed rationality of history if, wherever we turn our glance, we find in it nothing but a play of brute and blind forces, a deeper and deeper flood of irrational instincts? Again: is not history, containing all the contrasts of the past and justifying equally theses and antitheses, by reason of their contribution to a common result, a general absolution of the wicked and the unjust, no less than of the good and the just? What discriminating value can its judgment have then, if all have the same rubric in common? And for the man of action anxious to rely on historical judgment is there not something paralysing in the need to recognize that whatever position he takes is equally justified or justifiable, if in the final result the antitheses count no differently from the theses? Why and how, for example, should I decide against Bolshevism, when I know that Bolshevism has its *raison d'être* in the present state of things, and that it will contribute no less efficaciously than its opposite in the final summing up of the present struggles? These and other charges are levelled against historicism, earning it the reputation of being guilty of promoting fatalism, of dissolving absolute values, of sanctifying the past, of accepting the brutality of fact *qua* fact, of applauding violence, of inculcating apathy; in a word, of taking away

¹ B. Croce, *La Storia come pensiero e come azione*. Bari, Laterza, 1938.

impetus and confidence from the creative forces, of blunting the sense of duty, and of encouraging inertia and slothful compromise.

Croce's replies follow the critiques in all the details and perplexities of their configuration, so that as a whole they form a complete review of the more pressing problems of the contemporaneous world. As it is impossible to give a minute account of them, I will confine myself to a reference to some which may give an idea of the general orientation of Crocian thought. Against the historical fatalism resulting from the alleged neutralization and indifference of opposites in history, Croce enunciates a concept of great importance, which may show itself very fruitful in its development: that of historical catharsis. "To write histories," Goethe said on one occasion, "is a way of getting the past off one's shoulders. Historical thought reduces it to one's material, transforms it to one's object, and historiography frees us from history. Only a strange darkening in the ideas can hinder us from perceiving such cathartic function as historiography accomplishes equally with poetry, the latter releasing us from the bondage of passion, the former from servitude to facts and the past; and only a more strange blinding of intelligence makes us consider and call gaoler the man who opens the door of the prison in which otherwise we should remain confined" (p. 31).

Similarly the sophism of interpreting the concept of the rationality of history as an incentive to practical acquiescence in the accomplished fact is exposed by Croce in all its falseness. A single example suffices to illustrate it, he says, taken from what befell in Russia during the reign of Nicholas I, when Hegelian philosophy began to be introduced there, in those little-prepared and uncritical intellects. Then several of the intellectuals, who had nourished the spirit of revolution and conspired with the Decemberists, began to reason thus: "All that exists is rational. But the despotism of Nicholas I exists. Therefore we must reconcile ourselves to it." The nullity of this extravagant syllogism is shown by saying with equal reason: "All that exists is rational. But hatred and the spirit of rebellion against the despotism of Nicholas I exist. Therefore it is not necessary to be reconciled with Nicholas I." With that you are practically back at the original point. The sophism is to be found in taking the word "rational" in two senses: of "that which has its *raison d'être*" and of "that which, in the particular circumstances in which it is placed, moral conscience bids each one of us to do." In the first sense, the despotism of Nicholas I is as rational as the action of the revolutionary; in the second sense, quibbling, that is, with the first, and reasoning with a *quaternio terminorum*, one assumes a practical attitude not founded on the single voice of moral conscience. "It is necessary," Croce concludes, "generally to distrust those who instead of producing from their actions and their behaviour an intrinsic and moral reason, appeal to so-called historical necessity, which too often, as we know, is the necessity of personal convenience" (p. 199).

On the presence of the so-called "irrational" element in history Croce makes some very just reflections which, especially to-day, demand our careful attention. He does not deny that beneath the surface of spiritual life there exist vital forces ready to burst out; but to estimate their strength and consistency, to approve them as powerful energies to be educated and not to be weakened and suppressed, is not the same thing as to admire their roughness and violence, and to elevate those who have represented them and to venerate them as the topmost peaks of humanity. Such idolizing is unfortunately a sign of moral degradation, low ideal, sluggish and corrupt feeling, a relationship of admiration and love of as little worth as that of prostitutes for bullies (p. 164). And in this connection Croce considers it stupid to exalt the State

PHILOSOPHY

which is a necessary condition of stability for the development of the highest spiritual work, to its supreme culmination: exactly as if one were to say that the goal of thought and art and morals is to secure a good digestion for the human organism. The fact that the safety of the State becomes *suprema lex* in moments of difficulty, of wars and revolutions, corresponds perfectly to the case of the suspension of the superior workings when the stomach is indisposed and it is necessary to await its restoration to health (p. 165).

In conclusion, the dominant note in this book, recurring through a thousand variations, is the spirit as liberty, leading to historicism as the theoretical expression of human liberty, which is completed by the practical and moral affirmation of liberty itself. This does not mean that Croce subordinates his historical-philosophical outlook to a particular political belief. For him liberty is a metapolitical value which permeates not one definite political theory, but all politics together, or rather is manifest in their reciprocal interrelationships and conflicts. Naturally even this view seems in conflict with the changes of the present time, and in the light of a narrow empiricism it may be considered as surpassed or belied by experience; but it is a property of philosophy, in contradistinction to the common empiricism, that it may wander in a horizon far broader than the one continually circumscribed and restricted by the daily changes of life. In this wider perspective the same experiences of to-day take on a different shape and proportion, and the man who is deeply convinced that the life of the spirit does not for long permit restriction, much less suppression, cannot help but draw from a more comprehensive view of history the reasons for a virile optimism.

GUIDO DE RUGGIERO.

(Translated from the Italian by Constance M. Allen.)

NEW BOOKS

Through Science to Philosophy. By H. DINGLE, B.Sc., A.R.C.S. (Oxford and London: Clarendon Press, Humphrey Milford. 1937. Pp. v + 363. Price 15s. net.)

This book is based on a course of lectures given in the Lowell Institute, Boston. Professor Dingle is well known as a very careful exponent of difficult scientific subjects. He has the power of making work which is abstruse, and based on technical developments, clear to the general reader without undue loss of accuracy. Moreover, he has a great advantage over some other writers who attempt similar tasks: he is not in the least impelled by the queerness of modern physics into taking the highly paradoxical statements in which they are often expressed at more than their face value. There are, as Professor Dingle says, gifted expositors in this field who have made the rough places so smooth that it is scarcely possible to tread on them without slipping! But he himself knows that, in the last resort, such results will have to be fitted into the framework of common-sense experience. It is perfectly true that the discoveries of science are always shocking at first to common-sense views; and that whoever wishes to go further and become a philosopher must learn (as Bertrand Russell has told us) not to be frightened by absurdities. It is, indeed, the function of reflection at its best to open our eyes to unfamiliar possibilities, and so free us from the tyranny of custom. Nevertheless, philosophers of science often need to be brought back to everyday realities by the bladder-boys of Swift's satiric imagination.

Professor Dingle performs the function of an enlightened bladder-boy admirably. He deals, in Part II of this book, with a whole set of problems in this manner. Those raised by the unobservable entities used in the physical sciences; with the problems involved in subjective and physical time; with the spate of confusions raised by the measurement of time and the supposed running down of the universe. He provides a critical estimate of recent loose talk concerning indeterminacy and freewill as questions brought to the forefront by the quantum theory. And there are many wise things said about such difficult matters as causality and the nature of our astronomical universe. In all these cases what Professor Dingle is trying to do is to insist that the outstanding achievements of present-day physics are not in the least nonsensical or paradoxical. He relates them to a general scheme (which he propounds in detail in Part I, and applies in Part II) concerning the manner in which scientific work first, and then philosophical thought, arises out of, and is based on, a common-sense attitude to the world.

The title of Professor Dingle's book expresses in itself this point of view: *Through Science to Philosophy*. It is a view which is plausible enough to be attractive, but not plausible enough to be accepted without argument. And in spite of Professor Dingle's persuasiveness, I do not feel that the arguments provided are completely convincing. I believe, like Professor Dingle, that science proceeds out of common-sense experience by approaching it in a more critical manner; and that by being more critical, it reveals unsuspected relationships between the parts of our knowledge, and therefore becomes more systematic. In short (in Huxley's phrase) science is organized common

PHILOSOPHY

sense. This I believe to be true, in spite of Dr. Norman Campbell's demurrer that, so far as physical science is concerned, it is the most esoteric of all the arts. That is why I can say that the exposition of scientific ideas in Professor Dingle's book seems to me to be on the right lines. But the further position which Professor Dingle adopts, and which I used to think the correct one, does not now seem to me to be tenable. It is the view that the step from science to philosophy is the same in character as this. That philosophy is, in short, just an attempt to deal more critically and more systematically with the results passed on to it by the special sciences. He really believes that "If, without violating the principles on which physics and biology have developed, science can extend its correlations over the whole of experience, it will become philosophy" (p. 34).

Now if this were true, the work of the philosopher would simply be that of the scientist writ large. This is claiming both too much and too little. Taking a glance at the philosophers one knows, it would be absurd to claim for them that they were capable of performing this function of being super-scientists. The claim would be so immodest as to be comic. Professor Dingle realizes this when he says (p. 14) that "at the present time the physicist has a better chance of obtaining a sufficient knowledge of philosophy than the philosopher has of obtaining a sufficient knowledge of physics, for the same reason that a seaman acquires land-legs more quickly than a landsman acquires sea-legs." On the other hand, the philosopher does seem to me to have a function of his own: at once humbler and more ambitious. Perhaps an old phrase of Frege's may make this clearer. He spoke of the tree of knowledge; and of science as mounting upwards with the increasing intricacy of the growing tree: whereas philosophy digs down to the roots. It is a crude metaphor for my purpose, because I want to suggest that the work of the philosopher is more than looking into the basic foundations of all our knowledge. But it serves my purpose if it brings home the idea that the labours of scientific and philosophic workers are aimed in opposite directions. That is why I do not agree with Professor Dingle that science, even augmented by psychology, may ever grow into a complete philosophy. Science is perpetually adding to statements of fact; philosophy analyses them, in the sense of finding out the structure of that to which reference is made if these facts are true. Thus the analysis employed by philosophy is not directed to undermining common sense, nor even to undermining the very uncommon sense in which scientific developments are often expressed. Philosophy is simply an attempt to deal in an unusually rigorous manner with both common sense and scientific statements. Not to explain them away, but to refine them; to find out what their various propositions mean, in the sense of being able to give a correct analysis of their structure.

It is this which gives to a great deal of modern philosophical work the appearance of being purely linguistic. It seems as though the logical positivists, for example, are telling us that philosophy reduces to a mere analysis of language. Professor Dingle is both attracted and repelled by such work: attracted because it is clearly a serious attempt at doing something in as rigorously critical a form as possible, and repelled because what it is doing seems to be a matter merely of grammar or syntax. If it were that only, it would be absurd. It might just as well be said that men need not have experiences, provided they can write and speak clearly about them—a view which (in the history of university education) has often been held by more pretentious persons than logical positivists! Needless to say, I do not hold the view that philosophical analysis is merely linguistic: but I do think that it is a serious and necessary attempt to translate all the propositions of

NEW BOOKS

common sense and science into statements which tell us what is the case if these propositions are significant and true.

So much for the general position adopted by Professor Dingle in this book. In fairness to him, it ought to be added that he himself is not dogmatic about it. He says (p. 38), "I am not attempting to make out a case for science to be considered as the royal road to philosophy. I believe that, in fact, it is, and that at present it has no serious rival; but that belief is, I hope, not a prejudice, and I am willing to admit—nay, even to insist—that it may prove to be misleading." Professor Dingle does, however, make a serious effort to construct a consistent world view out of "atoms of consciousness" (in the sense in which he defines them) and their various groupings. It is impossible in a short review to do justice to this construction in detail. I can only say that I think it well worth consideration.

A word must, however, be added about Professor Dingle's admirable criticisms of some of the cruder views of men of science in this field. In his treatment, for instance, of those views of the relation of science to social needs which ascribe economic factors as the basis for completely independent and abstract developments in pure science (quite unrelated to such needs) Professor Dingle says that to interpret the work of Galileo and Newton as a product of the invention of gunpowder is "as worthy of consideration as interpretation of wave mechanics in terms of the discoveries of M. Marcel." Again, in Chapter V on "The History of a Delusion" there is a valuable discussion of the difficulties concerning the whole problem of substance in modern physics; and here, too, Professor Dingle's combination of knowledge and wit makes it thoroughly amusing reading. The same applies to his treatment of both behaviourism (p. 140 *et seq.*) and of the unconsciousness (p. 145 *et seq.*).

To sum up, Professor Dingle has boldly ventured on a constructive synthesis in the field of philosophy of science. It is incomplete, as he himself would be the first to admit. Indeed, he speaks of its "loose ends" on p. 353. But it is, in my opinion, a very interesting attempt.

A. E. HEATH.

The Principles of Mathematics. By BERTRAND RUSSELL. Second edition (London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd. 1937. Pp. xxxix + 534. Price 18s.)

An Introduction to Symbolic Logic. By SUSANNE K. LANGER. (London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd. 1937. Pp. 363. Price 12s. 6d.)

The first edition of Bertrand Russell's important work has long been out of print. The few second-hand copies obtainable have cost the eager buyer many times the price of this second edition. Messrs. Allen & Unwin may be congratulated upon this production; it can be taken for granted that they will have their reward. In the present edition the text is unaltered; the same pagination has been carefully retained; the printing bears comparison with the original. There is a new Introduction, of ten pages, in which Russell briefly discusses the present position of his view that logic and mathematics are identical. He sees no reason to abandon this view although he no longer adheres to his earlier Platonic realism. He briefly examines the criticisms directed against the Frege-Russell doctrine by the formalists and the intuitionists. I am inclined to think that he is not quite just to the Hilbert school of logicians. He does not take into account the bearings of Gödel's work upon the formalization of logic and fails to recognize that the main aim of

PHILOSOPHY

Hilbert's work is to supply proofs of consistency, not to put forward a complete philosophy of mathematics.

Russell also discusses briefly the recent attempts to assimilate logic to grammar. He agrees with Carnap that logical constants belong to a language and not to the subject-matter about which the language speaks. He is, however, dissatisfied with the doctrine that whether a proposition is analytic or not is relative to the language to which the proposition belongs. He holds, on the contrary, that there must be "a sense" in which a proposition of logic is true in virtue of its form. It is much to be hoped that Russell will deal more fully with this point for the present discussion is too brief to be of much use.

"Logic," says Dr. Langer, "is to the philosopher what the telescope is to the astronomer: an instrument of vision" (p. 46). The astronomer does not grudge the labour required for making slight improvements in his instrument; similarly, the philosopher should not grudge the labour of improving the technique of logic. She urges that "every philosopher should be not only acquainted with logic, but intimately conversant with it; for the study of logic develops the art of *seeing structures* almost to the point of habit, and reduces to a minimum the danger of getting lost amid abstract ideas" (p. 334). This is the point of view from which this *Introduction to Symbolic Logic* has been written. Accordingly, Dr. Langer first tries to make clear to the student such notions as logical form, structure, form and content, abstraction and interpretation. These notions are explained in a very simple way and illustrated by examples that will be familiar to the student. The essentials of logical structure are explained in two admirable chapters dealing with relations, propositions, truth-values, and systems. The principles governing symbolic expressions are clearly stated, the usual distinction between natural and symbolic languages is elucidated, and the power of symbols is emphasized. There is a valuable chapter on *Generalization*, which contains an extremely clear account of propositional forms (or functions). It is much less confusing to speak of propositional *forms* instead of propositional *functions*, as the present reviewer pointed out some time ago. Dr. Langer's exposition of quantifiers and of general propositions is very clear and simple.

Chapters V, VI, VII, and VIII contain respectively good expositions of classes, the principal relations among classes, the universe of classes, and the deductive system of classes. Controversial issues are avoided, which is all to the good from the point of view of the elementary student. Here and elsewhere, as for example in her discussion of "logical form," Dr. Langer may give the student a misleading impression that there are no real difficulties to be overcome. Whilst it is desirable that these difficulties should not be discussed in an elementary introduction to the subject, it would have been better to hint that they exist. This is, however, but a small criticism. Chapter IX, on *The Algebra of Logic*, is excellent. The relation of an algebra to a calculus is well explained.

Chapter X, on *Abstraction and Interpretation*, is of central importance from the point of view of Dr. Langer's exposition of logic. She shows how logic, regarded as the science of forms, proceeds by steps from totally concrete notions to totally formal notions. Three such steps are distinguished. First, the separate elements of an uninterpreted, or concrete, universe of discourse, K , are formalized; in this step we attain a partial generalization of a system KR . In the second step K is left uninterpreted; it is regarded merely as the range of significance of the relation R . We thus obtain general propositions about unspecified concrete things; this represents "the *greatest generalization* of the system KR ." The third step consists in leaving R uninterpreted; the

NEW BOOKS

system then becomes a system *in abstracto*, and we obtain completely abstract propositions, and these are completely generalized propositional forms. It is, in Dr. Langer's view, "the essential business of logic" thus to abstract the form from the content. In the development of the technique required to attain this aim we develop also the habit of "seeing structures." This chapter also contains a useful exposition of most of the important properties of relations. The calculus of propositions is discussed in the following chapter.

Two final chapters provide a useful introduction both to the work of Dr. Langer herself and also to *Principia Mathematica*. Dr. Langer rightly emphasizes the continuity of the development from Boolean Algebra to the work of Russell and Whitehead.

There can be no doubt that Dr. Langer has provided an excellent introduction to this subject. She claims that her work has "no predecessor", from the point of view of arrangement. This claim is just. She professes that it has had "one inspirer", namely, Prof. Sheffer of Harvard. Since acquaintance with the work of Sheffer is for the most part confined to the circle of his disciples, other students of symbolic logic will be grateful for this glimpse of his conception of logic.

Each chapter is provided by Dr. Langer with a careful summary, questions for review, and suggestions for class work. She has added a short bibliography and has provided a satisfactory index.

L. SUSAN STEBBING.

The Problem of Time: University of California Publications in Philosophy, Vol. 18. (Berkeley, California: University of California Press. London: Cambridge University Press. 1936. Pp. 225. Price 2 dollars 25; 10s.)

Those members of the Philosophical Union of the University of California who deliver every year a set of lectures on some selected topic have frequently put us in their debt by the publication of their lectures. They have usually chosen a topic of considerable interest to contemporary philosophers and have had much to say that was stimulating. It must be admitted that the volume of lectures now being reviewed does not reach the level attained in the earlier volumes. This, at least, is my judgment. I may be mistaken for, I confess, I found some of the lectures boring to read. For this reason I have read, and in the case of some of the lectures have re-read, carefully but without much enthusiasm. There is a considerable amount of repetition, especially in the various attempts to get under weigh. For the most part each of these eight lecturers starts over again. There are some references in the later lectures to some of the preceding lectures, but there is neither the liveliness proper to a symposium nor the continuity of thought that might be found had one of these authors written a single book on the subject proposed for discussion. Perhaps something is amiss with the topic at least as given in the title of the volume. What is *the* problem of time? Is there one and only one problem? If so, what is it? To these questions it is reasonable for us to expect answers. The value of these lectures is in my opinion roughly determined by the extent to which the lecturers have been aware of these questions and have attempted to answer them. It is from this point of view that I shall try to evaluate these eight contributions to discussions about *time*.

Prof. W. R. Dennes and Prof. E. W. Strong are aware of the importance of asking these questions. If I understand them aright, neither of them thinks that there is a special, and peculiarly difficult, metaphysical problem of time. "I can see no problem," says Prof. Strong, "of how a world is temporal

PHILOSOPHY

in a world where we can count our pulses, number the succession of days and nights, observe the phases of the moon and the positions of the sun above the horizon" (p. 79). He suggests that "philosophers have not so much accepted" the observation of counting our pulses, etc., "as they have sought to interpret it in other terms." He urges that philosophers have elaborated their theories of time in the interest of some metaphysical theory. This contention is illustrated by a (necessarily very brief) discussion of the view of Anselm and of Sir Isaac Barrow. He then sets forth his own view, indicated by the title of his lecture, "Time in Operational Analysis." As may be expected, he maintains that: "Time as a concept can be clarified, first, in respect to how the word is used in discourse; and, second, in respect to what is empirically meant by that discourse" (p. 54). Prof. Dennes ("Time as Datum and as Construction") insists that the meaning of such a question as "Is time real?" depends upon what is to be understood by each of the words used in asking the question. He argues that philosophers who answer the question negatively have either combined words in a meaningless form or have given a special meaning to the word "real," thereby begging the question. He is quick to seize upon the truisms that have masqueraded as profound truths. Thus, for example, he points out that "to assert the irreversibility of time as a universal ontological principle" is only to utter a truism, namely, that "every process is what it is" (p. 97). I understand him to be maintaining that it follows from our usage of the word "process" that a process cannot be reversed. Reversal must be clearly distinguished from repetition. It is, I think, not at all uncommon in discussions concerning time to fall, on the one hand, into truisms, and, on the other hand, into self-contradictions. An example of a truism from Santayana is pleasantly revealed by Prof. Mackay (see p. 189) in his lecture entitled "Succession and Duration," but it is too long to quote here.

Prof. P. Marhenke ("McTaggart's Analysis of Time") shows—in my opinion conclusively—how untenable is McTaggart's argument designed to establish the unreality of time. Prof. V. F. Lenzen ("The Schema of Time") has not added much to what has been said elsewhere both by himself and others. In the context of these lectures his contribution may be summed up in the two statements: "Time is the order of succession of phenomena"; "A schema of time is a frame in an order of succession of natural phenomena." Prof. S. C. Pepper ("The Order of Time") is mainly concerned to extricate Prof. Sidney Hooke and Prof. Dewey from difficulties into which, he believes, they have fallen owing to their failure to appreciate the fact that in nature there are many orders of time. His lecture is not readily intelligible to anyone who has not read the works criticized.

Prof. J. Lowenberg ("The Nonspecious Present") is alone among these contributors in his insistence upon "the mystery of time." To this mystery experience is said to be "the key." The specific experience required is the experience of "the nonspecious present." "We need a nonspecious present," he says, "to keep time itself from collapsing like a house of cards" (p. 131). This sentence is to me so mysterious that I cannot attempt to unravel it.

Prof. G. P. Adams ("Temporal Form and Existence") and Prof. Mackay—to whose lecture reference has already been made—are both concerned with the distinction between duration and succession. Prof. Mackay maintains that "our time experience is an experience of succession in duration" (p. 199), to which is added, on the next page, "within the perspective of an enjoyed present." He lays stress upon the past, present, future, determinations, and, in common with Prof. Lowenberg, criticizes William James's theory of the specious present. Prof. Adams, who regards successiveness as

NEW BOOKS

"the defining characteristic of time," insists that what is fundamental is the serial order of before and after. He says: "We apply a temporal form to the totality of what is presented. The temporal pattern is simply the transitive, asymmetrical relation of before and after. It is through the employment of this pattern that the presented—which, as such, is tenseless—is transformed into the temporal present" (p. 213). There are surely difficulties concealed in this use of the word "transformed." It does not seem to me that Prof. Adams succeeds in making his theory at all convincing.

As is only to be expected, the words "persistence," "existence," and "permanence" occur in many of these lectures. It is to be regretted that the different lecturers do not always use them in the same sense. That there is no agreed sense is no doubt mainly due to the divergence of views. Something might have been done, however, to make clear to the reader—and perhaps also to the writers themselves—why they cannot agree in their terminology and wherein lies the significance of their diverse usages of the same word. Could this be made clear, that we might hope for an enlightening contribution to the discussion of time.

L. SUSAN STEBBING.

The Logical Syntax of Language. By RUDOLF CARNAP. Translated from the German by Amethe Smeaton (Countess von Zeppelin). (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd. 1937. Pp. xvi + 352. Price 25s.)

A review has already appeared in this journal of the original German edition of this important work by Prof. Carnap, whilst the present reviewer wrote a critical notice of it in *Mind* (1935). Accordingly this notice will be brief and will be mainly concerned with points relating to the English translation. This book must have been extraordinarily difficult to translate. Prof. Carnap's German is clear and delightful to read. The difficulty lay mainly in finding correct English equivalents of certain words and phrases. In some cases there was no English word that would serve as an exact translation; in other cases the correct equivalent had already been used in the context of some other system from which it had acquired associations that would be misleading in the context of Prof. Carnap's work. These difficulties have been almost entirely overcome either by coining new words or by appropriating words, not hitherto used in a technical sense, and giving them a definite technical significance. The translation is in the main the work of Countess von Zeppelin, but it has been revised and improved owing to the co-operation of Dr. E. C. Graham, Dr. O. Helmer, Dr. E. Nagel, and the author himself, who further expresses gratitude to Dr. W. V. Quine for "valuable suggestions with regard to terminology." The result of this co-operation is extremely happy. There can be no doubt that this is a first-rate translation; it is to be hoped that it will result in giving us a well-established English terminology.

In this English edition Prof. Carnap has fortunately been able to incorporate some sections that were excluded from the German edition owing to lack of space; he has also made additions and alterations inspired, no doubt, in part by criticisms of the original work. These additions include an interesting section on Identity (§ 16), sections on Incomplete and Complete Criteria of Validity, Reduction, Evaluation, a further treatment of "analytic" and "contradictory" in Language II, Logical Content, and some other points relating to the Rules of Consequence for Language II (§ 34 *a-i*); three new sections (§ 34 *a-c*) are added to the treatment of "Further Developments of

PHILOSOPHY

Language II," the main part of which had been published, in a slightly different form, in a paper entitled *Ein gültigskriterium für die Sätze der klassischen Mathematik*. Another paper, entitled *Die Antinomien und die Unvollständigkeit der Mathematik*, now appears incorporated into Part IV of the present work. All these additions are of interest and increase the value of the work. Special mention should be made of Prof. Carnap's discussion of Gödel's Arithmetized syntax. This is, so far as the present reviewer is aware, the first discussion presented in English of Gödel's existence theorem. It is to be hoped that it will interest English readers in Gödel's work. The bibliography has been brought up to date; several corrections have been made all of which constitute distinct improvements. No student of logical syntax can afford to dispense with this English edition. It is very well printed in a pleasing form and is remarkably free from misprints.

L. SUSAN STEBBING.

A Commentary on Kant's "Critique of Judgment." By H. W. CASSIRER.
(London: Methuen & Co. 1938. Pp. xii + 412. Price 2s.)

The *Critique of Judgment* may be regarded as the coping-stone of the Critical Philosophy. Only when its teaching has been understood can we be in a position to grasp fully the relation between Kant's speculative and his ethical philosophy and to follow the structure of his system as a whole. Yet, so far as I am aware, it has never been made the subject of an adequate and detailed commentary. There are indeed valuable expositions and criticisms of its doctrines, notably in Caird's work, *The Critical Philosophy of Kant*, and in Ernst Cassirer's *Kants Leben und Lehre*; but these works give the student comparatively little help in his attempt to meet the many difficulties that arise as he fights his way, sentence by sentence, through the intricacies of Kant's argument. The *Critique of Judgment* is indeed in some ways easier than Kant's other works, but, as I know from experience, it may seem largely unintelligible to a reader who is not an expert in Kant's terminology. In the vast body of *Kantliteratur* there was here a great gap which was urgently crying out to be filled.

In my opinion Dr. H. Cassirer has been highly successful in his attempt to fill this gap. He says modestly in his preface that when he began this work more than four years ago, he had not made any special study of Kant and was practically ignorant of the English language. But being a son of Ernst Cassirer he has breathed the Kantian atmosphere from his earliest youth; and he has the advantage of having been trained as a classical scholar who specialized in ancient philosophy. The excellence of his translations and the clarity and conciseness of his English style show that his linguistic training and aptitudes have enabled him to overcome the difficulty of writing in a foreign language. I doubt whether any reader would suspect that English was not his mother tongue. The only slip I have noticed is a tendency to speak of "common sense" where "a common sense" would help to make Kant's meaning more clear.

One great merit of this book is its firm grip of the Critical Philosophy as a whole. Dr. Cassirer devotes the first ninety-four pages to a brief exposition of the *Critique of Pure Reason* and the *Critique of Practical Reason*. For this he has no need to apologize: it provides a masterly summary of Kant's thought which is valuable in itself besides enabling him to dispense with many explanations which could not have been introduced without awkwardness into the body of his *Commentary*.

This preliminary exposition is followed by a careful study of Kant's First

NEW BOOKS

Introduction to the *Critique of Judgment*. This First Introduction in its complete form was not published till 1914 and is not well known in this country. It is very much fuller than the introduction which was substituted for it; and I agree with Dr. Cassirer in holding that the only reason why Kant suppressed it was, as he himself said, because of its length. It is of the utmost value for the understanding, not only of the *Critique of Judgment*, but also of the whole Critical Philosophy; and it gives by far the best account of what Kant believed to be the presuppositions of induction. In making its doctrine easily accessible to English readers, and in his patient solution of the many difficulties it contains, Dr. Cassirer has performed a very great service indeed.

His exposition of the *Critique of Aesthetic Judgment* shows the same careful scholarship and clarity of thought. Dr. Cassirer believes that Kant's thought forms what by ordinary human standards must be called a consistent whole; and he is often successful in showing that seeming contradictions can be explained in the light of similar passages elsewhere. When he is unable to solve a problem, he has no hesitation in admitting it frankly. His method may indeed be found by some a trifle austere. He offers us no help in the way of chapter and section titles, and simply follows Kant's own sections with their numerical headings. This is bound to result in a certain amount of repetition—for Kant himself is undoubtedly repetitious—but it has the advantage that we can always find the explanation of any passage without difficulty, and it is only very occasionally that I at least have found the repetitions tedious. It should also be said that Dr. Cassirer's interest seems to lie less in the aesthetic problem as such than in Kant's solution of it as part of the Critical Philosophy. He seldom allows himself the relaxation of considering the more easy and human passages where Kant passes empirical judgments which throw a good deal of light on his own taste and character. The result is that the philosophic argument comes to us in a concentrated form unrelieved by lighter touches. For the student of the Critical Philosophy this is all that is necessary. Those who are interested primarily in the aesthetic problem may be reminded that Kant's aesthetic theory cannot be understood apart from the rest of his philosophy. I believe that Dr. Cassirer's book will give them an opportunity of understanding it with the minimum effort necessary to get some conception of its background.

Kant's account of teleology is often said to be inadequate, but for myself I must say that I found Dr. Cassirer's account of the *Critique of Teleological Judgment* to be quite exciting. There is in it less repetition than in the purely aesthetic part, and the doctrine expounded seems to me to offer less difficulty: indeed, I should be inclined to say that it is obviously true. Incidentally a good deal of light is thrown on Kant's view of intuitive understanding.

A very full analytic index has been added, and is all the more necessary because of the paucity of chapter headings.

It should be clearly understood that this book is what it claims to be, namely, a commentary. For some reason that I have never been able to fathom, it appears to be generally assumed that in the case of Kant, and of Kant alone, a commentator ought to explain not merely what his author says, but what he ought to have said. Dr. Cassirer is fully aware that the first task of a commentator is to explain his author's meaning, and in this he has attained a very high degree of success. Some readers may possibly wish that he had attempted to give a more critical estimate of the value of Kant's philosophy. I do not share this view, though I think that some of Kant's conceptions might have been submitted to a fuller analysis; for example, I should have liked to see a full-dress discussion of what Kant meant by "reflexion." Kant's views generally seem to me so much more interesting and important

PHILOSOPHY

than those of his commentators that it is a source of irritation when one is called away from the difficult task of understanding them to a consideration of theories (this is most obvious in the case of nineteenth-century commentators) which are long since dead, while Kant remains obstinately alive. From this defect Dr. Cassirer's work is wholly free.

Dr. Cassirer has omitted something like twenty sections and the whole of the Methodology. Probably he could not have dealt with these without making the work too long, and on the whole the sections omitted are comparatively easy to understand. I do, however, regret the omission of Section 59, which seems to me of great importance and to offer less difficulty than Dr. Cassirer himself appears to have found in it.

In conclusion, I would say that, as Dr. Cassirer fully recognizes, no commentary at the present stage of Kantian criticism can be wholly free from error, but a careful study of his work has left me with very few places where I am inclined to question the soundness of his judgment. I can confidently recommend his book as a reliable guide to Kant's thinking, whether it is used as a help in reading Kant or treated as an independent work. He has given us a commentary which should long remain authoritative and indispensable; and I hope we may look forward to other philosophical writings from him in the future.

H. J. PATON.

Descartes' "Discourse on Method." By LEON ROTH. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, Humphrey Milford. 1937. Pp. vi + 142. Price 6s.)

In this book Professor Roth argues for the serious treatment of the *Discourse* as Descartes' own summing-up of his contribution to science and philosophy, and as throwing valuable light upon the order of his thinking, the relative strength of his interests, and the importance of his total achievement. He reaches the conclusion that Descartes' fundamental interest was in science (i.e. mathematical physics), always with an eye to its practical value. Metaphysics interested him only in so far as it was needed to give him a basis for his physics—it was "not an end in itself" (p. 29). Negatively, therefore, the book is a reasoned protest against the habit of "fixing on the *Meditations* as embodying the essence of Cartesianism" (p. 74).

An examination of the literary history of the *Discourse* shows that it is "far from being a preliminary manifesto worked out (or abandoned) in the later *Meditations* and *Principles*. It is the retrospect of a Descartes who has *been through* the stages of *Meditations* and *Principles* and now looks back on them" (p. 73). It shows the order of his philosophical development to have been (1) method—as sketched in the second part of the *Discourse*; (2) exercises in the method—the scientific *Essays* to which the *Discourse* is an introduction; (3) metaphysics, pursued with the object of finding a sure foundation for physics—the *Meditations*; (4) mathematical physics or the philosophy of nature—the *Principles of Philosophy*. Descartes was already in his early twenties alive to the need of a metaphysical basis for his physics, but, as he tells us in the *Discourse*, he deliberately postponed the search for it till he should have reached a more mature age.

There is little or none of this likely to be questioned to-day, especially in the light of M. Gilson's research, to which Professor Roth acknowledges indebtedness in the Preface. But his central and novel contention concerns not the relative strength of Descartes' interests and the order of their development, but the value of the method itself and its relation to science. Professor

NEW BOOKS

Roth's main contention is that the method is not (what Descartes intended it to be) an instrument of discovery in the sciences, and that not only his immediate successors but even to some extent Descartes himself came to realize this; and further, that its rejection as an instrument of discovery made possible its recognition "as an independent entity"—i.e. as "logic" (pp. 97-8). "It is through the death of the *Essays* that the *Discourse* came to immortality" (p. 116). Now, if the method has no value for discovery and yet, as Professor Roth believes, it is Descartes' great contribution to knowledge, it would seem that its value can only lie in the power it gives us of analysing and ordering the knowledge we have gained by other means. But this is not after all what Professor Roth means. For his conclusion is (p. 108) that "Cartesianism has become a general method of approach to all problems, not a specific system of physics or metaphysics, and it is this general method which is of value, the ideal of order and precision, not the particular historical results which that ideal offered (or was supposed to offer) Descartes himself in his delving into the facts of nature." If all that Professor Roth meant was that Descartes himself fails to apply fully and properly a method which, when so applied, can be a valuable instrument of discovery, his meaning would be clear. But he seems first to deny and then to assert that the method is "an instrument of discovery" at all, outside the sphere of mathematics. He says, rightly, that it is "fruitful in mathematics just because it *is* mathematics" (p. 96). Is it just this same mathematical method—the method of the *Discourse* —(and if not, what is it?) which, once it has been proved useless in the solution of physical problems, is somehow able to shine forth as a valuable "general method of approach to all problems"? And if to all problems, why not to Descartes' own problems?

Professor Roth gives a plain answer to this last question, but I think a wrong one. According to him, Descartes' "official" view is that the truth of propositions about actually existing phenomena can be established only by unilinear deduction from self-guaranteed first principles, each step in the argument depending on the previous step, but contributing nothing to the establishment of those that precede it. With this he contrasts passages stating the incompatible doctrine that the process is what he calls "global"—i.e. not a chain but a circle, in which principles rest on consequences, including actual phenomena that can be observed or produced by experiment, as much as consequences on principles (pp. 92-5). Professor Roth has no difficulty in showing that the purely deductive method must fail when it has to deal with actual phenomena. But is he justified in ascribing this to Descartes as his only true position, and treating the other view as an incompatible alternative to it, which serves only to show that Descartes was beginning to find flaws in his own method? Plainly the "official" view will not square with Descartes' repeated insistence on the importance of observation and experiment, while this does square with the "unofficial" view, which might indeed be a statement of the ordinary scientific method of hypothesis and verification.¹ Let us examine Professor Roth's attack. He starts from Descartes' admission (e.g. in the sixth part of the *Discourse* and the *Author's Letter* introducing the French edition) that his method breaks down when he comes to deal with actual phenomena in their detail. Descartes himself accounts for the failure by his inability, owing to lack of means, to make the necessary observations and experiments. Professor Roth, on the other hand, ascribes it to an essential defect in the method itself. According to him, Descartes sets out to infer matter of fact from mere possibility, or, in other words, concrete nature from mere mathematics (p. 90). But, in Whitehead's words, which he quotes,

¹ The reader may here be referred to S. V. Keeling, *Descartes*, chapter 5.

PHILOSOPHY

"there is no valid inference from mere possibility to matter of fact." Hence when Descartes has to deal not with abstract mathematics but with actual phenomena his method is bound to break down.

This seems to me a wrong description of Descartes' procedure. There is only one place in his whole system in which he infers the actual from the possible—the ontological argument. The foundation of his metaphysics is not the possible but the actual existence of the self, from which he proceeds to the actual existence of God, and thence, by a circuitous route, to the actual existence of bodies. Thus in his *Physics* he presupposes not merely the conception of a possible extended world, but an actual extended world, and he assumes that, because its essence is extension, so that nothing can exist in it except the modes of extension, it must lend itself to mathematical treatment. In particular, the only process which is possible in it is motion according to certain laws. These are the assumptions with which Descartes' *Physics* starts. But unfortunately he does not regard them as assumptions. They are for him established by metaphysical argument, not taken as hypotheses to be verified or modified or rejected. It is, I suggest, this metaphysical background which gives to Descartes' procedure in *Physics* its peculiarly *a priori* character, rather than any attempt to deduce the actual from the possible. Descartes in his *Physics* always tries to explain actual phenomena by actual causal conditions. It is true that in the earlier stages of this explanation he deliberately dispenses with special observations and experiments. He does so on the ground that the general principles from which he starts enable him to deduce *a priori* the *most general* characters of the phenomena of nature. (And this would be legitimate if the principles themselves were treated as hypotheses.) But when he has to explain particular occurrences (e.g. the behaviour of magnets) or to solve a particular practical problem (e.g. the construction of a certain type of lens), then observation and experiment (one of which, incidentally, must *set* the special problem to begin with) are necessary to enable him to reject all but the relevant hypothesis out of a number equally compatible with his general principles. For what follows not from the general nature of the principles but from the special circumstances under which they work cannot be deduced *a priori* from them. Descartes rightly recognizes this, nor is the recognition inconsistent with the rest of his method. Where he went wrong was in supposing that if only he had the means and the time for adequate experiment he could make a great advance himself.

Whether or not I am right on this question as against Professor Roth makes little difference to the undoubted interest of his book. In particular, the general reader will find the chapters comparing Descartes with Bacon and with Pascal, and the account of Father Daniel's satire, the *Voyage du Monde*, which is used to play an ingenious part in the argument of the book, excellent reading.

I found two misprints. On page 29, last line of text, for "if" read "as" or "as if"; on page 94 the reference to Descartes' reply to Morin should be to vol. ii, not vol. iii.

A. K. STOUT.

Symbolism and Belief. By EDWYN BEVAN. (London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd. 1938. Pp. 391. Price 15s.)

A Gifford Lecturer has two difficulties to confront. So many courses have already been given, that it must be difficult to find a new approach to, or treatment of, the subject prescribed, and the condition that reason, and not

NEW BOOKS

revelation, must be set forth as the ground for belief must make it difficult for one who accepts the Christian revelation to keep within the limits imposed. The author of this volume has overcome the first difficulty, as he does offer a fresh contribution; and the second he meets by offering the Christian solution of any problem not on the basis of the authority of Bible or Church, but as itself reasonable. It need hardly be said that this course of Gifford Lectures presents all the excellences that one has learned to expect from any writings of the author—adequate and accurate knowledge, competent and balanced judgment, and lucid and attractive style.

The Introduction indicates the purpose—to show the part played by symbolism in belief. The author distinguishes symbols, which are visible objects or sounds which stand for something of which we already have direct knowledge, “such as flags or trumpets,” from symbols which “purport to give information about the things which they symbolize, to convey knowledge of their nature, which those who see or hear the symbols have not had before or have not otherwise.” For the first kind resemblance is not necessary, as for the second, which seek to convey by the known knowledge of the otherwise unknown (pp. 11–13). In religion both kinds of symbols have a place. All our conceptions of God are inadequate symbols; but this truth has not always been recognized as history shows. The symbols give some knowledge of God, though not the whole; and there must be discriminations in deciding how far the symbol can be regarded as resembling or not resembling the object. Our thought of God must be anthropomorphic, but there is a true and a false anthropomorphism. Nine lectures are devoted to the discussion of symbols, and six to “the relations of symbolism to truth and belief.”

The first symbol is taken from *Space—Height* as indicating God's transcendence, His superiority to all things. In the third lecture the author discusses reasons why height should be thus regarded. In dealing with the symbol from *Time*, he is handling one of the subjects of constant debate in philosophy, the relation of Time and Eternity; and he seems to me rightly to maintain that time must have some significance for God. One of the most generally diffused symbols for God is *Light*: and in the Christian revelation that symbol is freely used. It expresses not only intellectual quality, but perfection generally. The word *Spirit* has come to be so identified with the conception of God as incorporeal, immaterial, personal, that we are ready to forget that it, too, is a symbol. Its primary meaning is wind, breath, and so life. In the Old and the New Testament alike there is the tendency to distinguish soul as man's life, and spirit as God's, and man's only as dependent on God. Paul's distinction between the psychical and the pneumatic man is a notable illustration. Here the symbol seems to convey more of the reality than do the others.

What at first sight might appear a digression but which is fully justified is found in the two lectures on *The Wrath of God*. We are here warned against the false anthropomorphism: the human passions, resentment, vindictiveness, revenge must be eliminated from the symbol; but the true anthropomorphism allows us to work out an analogy between the human moral judgment regarding desert and punishment. While I am in substantial agreement with the author's conclusions, I must confess I should have welcomed more stress on God's grace. These nineteen lectures belong to what we may call the comparative study of religions, the five which follow to the philosophy of religion, or we might even say, the epistemology.

The eleventh lecture shows how early religious thought took literally what is now taken symbolically; and yet insists that not all the Scripture record,

PHILOSOPHY

especially the New Testament, can be regarded thus; for Christian faith affirms not only that Jesus was historically real, but that He is still present and active in the souls of men. The next lecture treats symbols without conceptual meaning. There are three main kinds of emotion called forth in this way by visible objects—the feeling of the beautiful, the sexual feeling, and the germinal feeling of religious awe (pp. 275–6). Interesting as is the discussion here, it need not be followed in detail.

The four lectures following are a progressive consideration of the grounds on which belief in the reality corresponding to the symbol may be based. Recognizing that the *pragmatic theory* may serve a useful purpose in man's dealings with inanimate nature, and is indeed derived therefrom, it is held to fall through in personal relations with man or God. In the one case we are concerned with results, in the other with the personal reality. When the personal relation is love, as in Christianity, pragmatism is unsatisfying. That we cannot know God as we can know our fellow-men, however, must be admitted. Can analogy lead us from the one to the other? How much truth can that yield? Less probably than medieval theology claimed, even although that same theology also recognized that even thus God cannot be fully known. A lecture is devoted to discuss Dean Mansle as representing the agnostic tendency in Anglican theology, though modified by his insistence on the authority of the revelation of God in the Holy Scriptures.

The values of Mysticism and Rationalism are next considered as approaches to the divine reality. While appreciating the testimony of the mystics to the reality of God, the author holds that there must be besides "some ground in our apprehensiveness of things." His judgment on Rationalism is negative: "No cogent rational inference can be made from the world to what is outside it" (p. 363). The justification for Belief is shown in the last lecture to lie in acceptance of, and loyalty to, human values, in rejecting the hypotheses that the world around man is indifferent to values, and in making the venture of faith, which will find its verification, that God cares for these values. Such a justification can be offered in relief of doubt; but the last ground of belief is this: "What actually causes anyone to believe in God is direct perception of the Divine." This bare outline may, I hope, whet the appetite of the reader to seek for himself the "feast of fat things" provided in the volume.

A. E. GARVIE.

The Principles of Art. By R. G. COLLINGWOOD. (Oxford at the Clarendon Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1938. Pp. xi + 347. Price 15s.)

This book, as I understand it, expounds without deviation Croce's theory that art is the expression of emotion. But it does expound it, and implements it with serious discussions of what is meant by emotion, imagination, expression, intuition, and by the identification of the last two, so that what had been a striking inspiration, summing up the vague hints of a hundred predecessors, becomes a reasoned creed. One can imagine the book written as a Platonic dialogue, with Croce as protagonist, often cornered, sometimes corrected, but fundamentally triumphant. Dr. I. A. Richards and Mr. Bernard Shaw would evidently have been cast for minor but picturesque parts.

The epistemological lacunas in Croce are supplied by detailed consideration of Hume's distinction between impressions and ideas; of Kant's "blind but indispensable function of imagination" in perception; of modern doctrines of *sensa*; of psychological theories of unconscious emotions and their repression or release.

NEW BOOKS

The history offered by Professor Collingwood of the genesis of art seems to be as follows. First, on the "psychic" level there is an impression or *sensum*, of which we are unconscious, but which, by analysis of what we later make out of it, we know to have consisted in an undifferentiated mass of sensation, such as a visual field with a scarlet patch in the centre, a lot of noise and a gripping sensation. Such a mass of sensation is always "charged with emotion," also unconscious, or with several undifferentiated emotions such as pain and panic. This emotion symptomizes or "psychically" (physiologically?) expresses itself in cringing, grimacing, howling, and the like. The next stage is the elevation of this total impression or part of it, by an act of attention or "imagination" to a conscious "idea." In this act we become conscious both of a *sensum* and of our sensing of it. And the *sensum* thus brought before consciousness is again always charged with emotion, this time conscious and consciously ours, such as anger, love, or grief, and these conscious emotions are, in becoming conscious, expressed not only "psychically," as before, by blushing and weeping, but also "linguistically" or consciously by words, tones, gestures, colours, shapes, and so on, perhaps imagined, perhaps real; but not identical with the *sensa* or ideas charged with the emotion thus expressed. If real, they afford a means of communication, from which an audience may recreate in themselves the original aesthetic process. There are, then, no unexpressed conscious emotions; it is one act which both creates the conscious idea with its emotion out of the psychical impression with its unconscious emotion, and also generates the linguistic out of the "psychical" expression. We have just said that the colours, words, tones, or shapes which "linguistically" express the conscious emotion may be real or imaginary. But we are told that they are not yet really either, or at least cannot be thought to be either, till a further process has taken place. This is "intellection," by which we "interpret" ideas (which, unlike impressions, can be held before the mind for the purpose) and "apprehend or construct" their relations, and according to those relations denominate them real, imaginary, or hallucinations.

To judge anything to be real is to apprehend or construct relations of one *sensum* to others; we *mean* by reality a *sensum* related to others in certain ways.

A reviewer may pick out two points in all this for discussion: (1) Was Hume, as Professor Collingwood asserts, really mistaken in thinking that among conscious experiences there is an initial difference, which he vaguely described as being that of greater vivacity, in what he accordingly calls impressions, than in ideas? Is there not, in fact, an immediate difference between the experience we take to be seeing pink or feeling anger and that which we take to be imagining pink or anger? No doubt when we have come to reflect upon an experience of pinkness and its relations, we often have to admit that what we took to be seeing pink, say a pink rat, was really an hallucination, and we perhaps might, in certain illnesses, mistake seeing rats for imagining them. (I doubt if we could mistake feeling angry for imaginary anger or *vice versa*.) Surely we should not call these corrected experiences hallucinations rather than memories or imaginations, unless there had been that initial difference, called by Hume greater vivacity, which led us *prima facie* to mistake them.

(2) Professor Collingwood opposes art to craft (as distinguished from bad art), with which the Greeks confused it, craft being the taking of means to a clearly conceived end. And the two crafts most commonly confused with art are what he calls "magic," that is the deliberate inducement of emotion which will issue in action, and "entertainment," which, by representation of natural things or *states of mind*, induces emotions, welcomed for their own

PHILOSOPHY

sakes. Most so-called "works of art" apparently come under one or other of these crafts, including the representational arts of sculpture, painting, epic and tragedy, which Plato banned, and the "magic" or religious art he might allow, though either of these might incidentally have an element of real art too. Almost the only works, apart from some music, to which the title of true art is unreservedly allowed are those of Jane Austen, T. S. Eliot, and Cézanne. But this is probably an accident, as few works are named at all, and those mostly contemporary, with the confessed aim of reforming our practice. Certainly we all feel the differences between art and amusement, between art and imitation, and between art and the *stimulation* of emotion. But the identification of these differences with one between the expression of emotion (which expression is then communicated) and the deliberate communication of emotion is difficult. Since the view is that we know nothing of emotions until expressed, any design to communicate them must presuppose that we have expressed them, so that what we design to communicate is the expression of an emotion; and that apparently is the true artist's design when he prints or exhibits. The examples of the things distinguished do not fortify the distinction. Miss Ruth Draper is cited as a typical entertainer or pseudo-artist. But I am persuaded that my experiences in hearing her and in reading Jane Austen, however different in degree, are essentially of the same kind. If I am right, either Professor Collingwood has mistaken one of his experiences, or one of his is really different from mine. But if he and I can be severally stimulated by the same communication to an aesthetic and an unaesthetic activity, his fundamental doctrine that criticism can be objective is shaken. It may be true, as he says, that we know the performer is not talking nonsense, but he may insist that she is talking entertainment and I, with equal obstinacy, that she is talking art. The same point may be approached in another way.

Professor Collingwood correctly points out that many critics of Plato, myself among them, have inaccurately said that all artists would be banished from his Republic, whereas the expression generally is "all mimetic artists," and he reminds us that Plato would retain "magical" poetry and music as propaganda for his guardians, and that he does not conceive of any third or genuine kind. This I think is what we always meant. Plato banished art *as such*, all expression of emotion (or the communication of such expression) that has no ulterior aim. He would only retain "pseudo-art." He clearly banishes all sculpture and painting, and tragedy and epic ὅσα ποιητικώτερα τοσόντω ἤττον ἀκονστέον. I doubt if he would have retained Jane Austen, or Mr. Eliot or Cézanne. I believe that, thinking the essence of these arts to be imitation (a belief perhaps explicable from the developments of draughtmanship in his lifetime), he thought them only justifiable if they imitated *κάλα*, a word under which he loosely included moral and aesthetic excellence. For, as we are told in the *Hippias Major*, what is beautiful is either good or productive of good. The "non-imitative" arts he admits as, one way or the other, good. But Professor Collingwood denies that either *καλόν* or "beauty" has any intrinsic connection with aesthetic experience. "To call a thing beautiful in Greek, whether ordinary or philosophical Greek, is simply to call it admirable or excellent or desirable." If this is so, I find it hard to understand why Socrates is represented as saying: "Whatever gives us pleasure, *not any sort of pleasure*, but pleasure of the eye or ear, is beautiful. For surely, Hippias, beautiful men and colour-patterns and pictures and statues please us when we see them; and beautiful voices and all music and poetry and prose and legendary stories have the same effect. . . . Nobody would not laugh at us if we called food and sweet smells beautiful instead of

NEW BOOKS

pleasant." Nor do I see how Aristotle could have said that beauty consisted *ἐν μεγέθει καὶ τάξει* or that its essentials are order, symmetry, and definition. Similarly, Professor Collingwood maintains that "the words *beauty*, *beautiful*, as actually used, have no aesthetic implication," and that we speak of a beautiful grilled steak with just the same literal propriety as of a beautiful sky or poem. This is a question of usage, and it seems sufficient to reply that Johnson's dictionary (4th edition) defines beauty as "that assemblage of graces or proportion of parts which pleases the eye," and quotes Locke: "Beauty consists of a certain composition of colour and figure, causing delight in the beholder." Certainly the *O.E.D.* further allows that "in modern colloquial use (e.g. 1868) the word is often applied to anything that a person likes very much, e.g. a beautiful soup." But when Keats said "beauty is truth," and Coleridge spoke of the "beautiful and beauty-making power," or Burke of the Sublime and Beautiful, I do not believe they could guess that they would be thought to allude to a quality eminently possessed by any grilled beef-steak. Even if I were wrong here, I should still urge that we need a word (perhaps "comely" or "fair") for the character we *prima facie* attribute alike to the clouds, faces, poems, patterns, statues which stimulate our aesthetic activities, but not to steaks however well grilled; though second thoughts might lead me to agree that the common character belongs only to the experience these things are apt to stimulate, though steaks are not. It is noteworthy that Professor Collingwood thinks the "*art of cookery*" an improper use of the word, though used it certainly is.

This brings us back to our original criticism. For why is Professor Collingwood so anxious to press the apparently verbal point that "beautiful" is not a term properly used both for the natural things and also for the paintings, poems, tunes, which alike stimulate us to aesthetic experience? Surely because he sees that whether natural things so stimulate us depends on what they mean for us, or rather on what we can make them mean; depends, that is to say, much on ourselves—on our age, sex, climate, race, religion, colour, upbringing, and culture. Consequently there is not, as Hegel supposed, an objective aesthetic quality in nature. But Professor Collingwood wants to maintain that the appreciation of art does not so depend, but that criticism can be objective. And by this he means not only that the artist really has (or has not) an aesthetic experience, but that this is so incarnate in the physical things—colours, shapes, words, tones—by which he completes and publishes his aesthetic experience, that we can be sure of either knowing it, or else of knowing that he did not really have one. But we cannot become aware of these physical things except by expressing our own unconscious *sensa* (with their emotional charges) as conscious ideas and then "relating them" into real objects. So we cannot perceive a Cézanne or a Frith picture until we have had an aesthetic experience. Why, then, should we judge that one painter had an aesthetic experience and not the other? How can the aesthetic experience, to which I am stimulated by seeing a Cézanne, possibly resemble the artist's? Mine is created out of my *sensa* and unconscious emotions occasioned by the physical things in which he expressed linguistically his *sensa* and unconscious emotions. But his *sensa* were occasioned by something quite different, namely physical things in which no emotion had yet been expressed. The theory of objective criticism presupposes that we know whether a physical thing expresses another artist's emotion or not. How is this possible since, in becoming aware of any picture, we have always expressed our own emotions occasioned by its effect on our senses, while the artist embodied in it the expression of his own emotions which had a quite different origin? Only if the presentation of the picture to my senses should occasion in me *sensa*

PHILOSOPHY

and emotions which I should then express linguistically in those very same *sensa*, i.e. in the colour-pattern of the picture. But, on this theory, the *sensa* which are charged with an emotion could not possibly be the linguistic expression of that emotion. Otherwise the aesthetic activity would be otiose.

Again, if, *per impossible*, I could hear Chinese music or *Sweeney Among the Nightingales* without having an aesthetic experience, would that prove the composers had none? Or if I do have one in seeing palæolithic paintings, does it prove they had?

To sum up this criticism, I cannot understand how the theory of the genesis of an aesthetic experience is consistent with the objectivity of criticism.

Besides his philosophical and artistic qualifications, Professor Collingwood is a distinguished ancient historian; and clearly there is a good deal of ancient history in this book—of the race, about savages; of the individual, about babies; of ideas, about their unconscious growth. The last two are connected with his main doctrine of expression. He maintains that a baby first makes such a sound as "Hatoff," not because it understands it as the name of an action or thing, but as an expression of triumph. My own observation leads me to conjecture that babies understand the meaning of some sounds like "Hat" or "Wash" and look for the object or try to make the motion before making any similar sounds themselves.

The historical excursus on savages, which is long, seems only necessary as a justification of the queer use of the word "magic" to mean practices which "when intelligently used" are designed to encourage ourselves or to alarm others into doing something, not to alter the course of nature. But I am told by theologians this is unorthodox sacramentalism. As my observation of babies is different, so my acquaintance with savages is little, and with my unconscious self *nil*. But I know a man who put his sick baby through a split sapling towards the sunrise. This I call magic, though it could hardly encourage the baby, and not himself unless he already believed that the act would cure it. And in the church of Cascob, in Radnorshire, is an eighteenth-century charm professing to safeguard Elizabeth Loyd from "desises" by the words "Pater Pater Pater Noster Noster Noster Ave Ave Ave . . . XOn XAdonay X Tetragammaton Jehovah . . . Abracadabra (repeated twelve times one letter shorter each time) Jah" and the signs of the zodiac. This I call magic, and it would only encourage Elizabeth if she already thought it was. No doubt there is much virtue in being "intelligently used."

It seems a pity that in what is perhaps the most serious attempt at a philosophy of art in our language, our attention should be diverted by what looks like a wilful perversity. But perhaps it is only ancient history for the use of philosophers, and on such matters "it is better to confine ourselves to myths, owing to our ignorance of where truth lies about the dark ages." Or, as Croce confesses of his own genetic of art: "Really there was no such matter; it has only been postulated for convenience of exposition."

E. F. CARRITT.

The Intelligent Individual and Society. By P. W. BRIDGMAN, Hollis Professor of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy in Harvard University. (New York and London: The Macmillan Company. 1938. Pp. vi + 305. Price 10s. 6d.)

In 1927 Professor Bridgman wrote an excellent book entitled *The Logic of Modern Physics*, in which he developed the view that the new situation in physics demands corresponding changes in our attitude to logic. He advo-

NEW BOOKS

cated what he called an "operational" theory of concepts. To give an account of a concept, it is necessary to describe an operation or set of operations, the performance of which will lead to particular experiences relevant to the concept; and if no such operations can be described, the concept is meaningless. The operations need not be exclusively physical: they include mental attitudes, and the use of language. But Professor Bridgman feels that an operational analysis is not ultimately satisfactory unless there is some element of what he calls "objective control," a term which I think involves some reference to physical experiment. At any rate he is suspicious of any concept which can be described only in terms of mental attitudes and verbal operations, whatever may be the states of mind which result, and, it seems even, whatever may be the pattern of behaviour which results. But this last point would call for a good deal of discussion. It is, he thinks, common for groups of people to engage in mutual verbal operations, which result in states of mind satisfactory to the members, often including intense convictions; but in so far as a group is content with verbal operations and their mental consequences, without any operations which involve physical control of a different sort, it is not applying what he would call a proper operational technique. He would, indeed, describe its activities as mystical. Most philosophies and all religions are for him mystical in this sense. He would not go so far as to call their operations meaningless. He calls them "footless" (78). Under this word Webster's dictionary quotes Tennyson's line, "Dreadful wastes where footless fancies dwell," and though I do not think that Professor Bridgman had this quotation explicitly in mind, it expresses fairly well the general atmosphere of the word.

The principles and conceptions which are ordinarily held to underlie the structure of society, when subjected to Professor Bridgman's operational test, fail. The greater part of the language used about duty, right, property, morality, justice, the state as a super-entity, etc., turns out on examination to be footless verbalism, which is useful in a fairly homogeneous social medium, as a means by which society can put pressure on not very intelligent people and force them to act in such a way as to preserve the social homogeneity; but intelligent people habituated to the operational technique will cease to be taken in by it.

Having shown this, Professor Bridgman deals with the question, what a society would be like if it were thoroughly penetrated by an operational technique, and what would be its chances of survival. The results may be briefly summarized. Each individual is the ultimate court of appeal as regards his own conduct. Being intelligent, he would want to make as good a job as possible of the problem of dealing intelligently with his own drives—"the drives that make me go"—other individuals being quite justified in dealing with him by force if the functioning of his drives brought him into conflict with them, and if they as intelligent individuals decided that this was the most satisfactory way of dealing with the situation. In the main, life would probably go rather more smoothly than it does now, since many of the conflicts and worries of life to-day arise more because (for footless reasons) people are not willing to live and let live than because of any genuine physical incompatibility between their various activities. Education would not be devoted so much to getting people to conform to certain standard patterns as to providing "the technique for criticism and modification of the drives," leaving "the specific drives as much as possible to the individual" (299). The individual, that is to say, would be encouraged to envisage as fully and as delicately as possible all the consequences of his behaving in such and such a way (including the various reactions of his fellows); but when that had

PHILOSOPHY

been done, he would have to be left to it, because footless appeals would no longer work.

The consequences of such an operational technique are not anything like what a "mystically minded" reader may be tempted to suppose, since the course of training which leads to operation-mindedness has effects on character likely to make for rather than against a satisfactory type of society. That is why I think that this view could perhaps be called "operational liberalism." Liberalism, as Bagehot said about Whiggism, is not a creed, it is a character; and I think that Professor Bridgman's whole book is inspired by the feeling that the constant effort to discover the truth in a scientific laboratory produces a discipline of mind and of character which qualifies for "citizenship" of a far higher order than that produced by the current "mystical" training. Not that he would insist that everybody be put to scientific research; but he feels that the life and outlook of the scientist could provide the inspiration for a better society than any existing at present.

But I must leave readers to look it up for themselves.

L. J. RUSSELL.

Studies in Hume's Ethics. By INGEMAR HEDENIUS (Uppsala and Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksells Boktryckeri-A.-B. Repr. from Adolf Phalén in Memoriam, 1937. Pp. 388-485. Price 4s.)

This short work is not intended as a systematic exposition of Hume's ethical theory. But the topics with which it is concerned are so central that it in fact combines something of the virtues of a general discussion with the careful and detailed elaboration of its special theme. Dr. Hedenius distinguishes two fundamental problems in Hume's moral philosophy. First comes "an examination of what is common and peculiar, on the one hand, to the qualities that are universally stated to be virtues, on the other hand to the so-called vices." And in the second place, "a psychological inquiry must be made into the approval and the disapproval that qualities must necessarily receive if they are to be characterized as virtues and vices respectively." Dr. Hedenius' long discussion of "Artificial Virtue" corresponds to the former of these problems (the connection here is a little thin, since it is on the artificiality rather than the virtuousness of justice that Dr. Hedenius concentrates): the latter is dealt with in the concluding section on "The Valuation of the Useful."

Hume's difficulty about justice is that he takes it seriously, but does not allow for motives adequate to account for it. "The only motive for acts of justice in society is the sense of duty": but, Hume holds, the sense of duty cannot be an *original* motive, and that is precisely why justice is an artificial and not a natural virtue. Thus we are left with the (insoluble) problem of "explaining how partial affections can have been inspired by an impartial end." Dr. Hedenius shows judgment and subtlety in tracing out the various tendencies in the vague and not very coherent theory that constitutes Hume's treatment of this problem. And if a doubt may be felt whether he is not at times needlessly elaborate, at least he seems to make good his case that some earlier interpretations have over-simplified Hume's position.

As regards the second theme of Hume's ethics, Dr. Hedenius brings out well the difference between Hume and Hutcheson. For Hume moral consciousness is just a special case of a general psychological principle of sympathy, and thus Hume could claim, as Hutcheson could not, to be "explaining" the moral judgment. Unfortunately this explanatory value is lost unless at the same time moral sympathy can be *distinguished* from other sympathy, and

NEW BOOKS

there Hume completely failed. There is, moreover, another difficulty in regard to the "useful" virtues for the view that sympathy constitutes moral approval. The approval must be for the virtue itself, but the sympathy can only be with the happiness that results from it. Hume himself appears to have been hardly aware of a problem here: but Dr. Hedenius (who rejects Vaughan's interpretation as applying rather to Adam Smith's theory than to Hume's) offers a partial solution of it in terms of Hume's own doctrine of a double association of ideas and impressions.

Dr. Hedenius concludes his essay with a discussion where, so it appears to me, his usual discretion deserts him. It turns on what he calls the "popular" conception of cause and effect, and involves the odd conclusion that Utilitarianism specifically, whatever may be true of moral theory generally, presupposes the idea of the freedom of the will. I must confess that some of the argument of this section appears to me merely sophistical.

But so far as exposition of Hume is concerned this is a sensible and suggestive work. I must add, however, that it could have been easier reading: there is a certain clumsiness in the movement of the argument and a failure to make quite clear the relation between its stages (particularly in the section on "Artificial Virtue") that might prevent a reader profiting as he should from Dr. Hedenius' scholarly and acute study.

W. G. MACLAGAN.

Kierkegaard. By WALTER LOWRIE, D.D. (London: Oxford University Press, Humphrey Milford. 1938. Pp. xviii + 636. Price 25s. net.)

The importance of Søren Kierkegaard, as the primary inspirer both of the "existential philosophy" and of certain contemporary movements in theology, is being increasingly realized, but as yet few of his extensive writings are available in English. (The Oxford University Press, in collaboration with the American Scandinavian Foundation, is publishing certain translations, of which the *Philosophical Fragments* has appeared.) We can therefore be grateful to Dr. Lowrie for an extremely full and careful study of Kierkegaard's life, illustrated with copious quotations from his writings. He has given us a comprehensive biography rather than a critical study of the philosophical and theological significance of Kierkegaard's work. For this the time is probably not yet ripe; but a book such as Dr. Lowrie's forms an indispensable preliminary. For if the "existential philosophy" is an attempt to grapple with the kind of thinking which cannot be done in the spectator's attitude of objective detachment, since the personality of the thinker is bound up in it, his biography, written with sympathetic imagination, plays an essential part in understanding his thought. Dr. Lowrie has given us such a biography of Kierkegaard, and the very interesting portraits which he reproduces are not the least revealing part of it.

It is a misfortune that Kierkegaard did not write in one of the major European languages, for then he might have been answered in his own day, and (as Dr. Haecker remarks¹), what is more important, he might have replied. As it was, his thought was either overlooked, or, while he himself saw it as a "corrective," it was taken by one-sided disciples as a comprehensive view. He himself did not look for disciples, but he would no doubt have welcomed the "sympathetic antipathy" which, as Dr. Lowrie says, he arouses in his few discerning interpreters. They have to fight with him to retain their own positions. Probably his real contribution lies in his power

¹ In his *Søren Kierkegaard* (Oxford University Press), the best short study of Kierkegaard known to me.

PHILOSOPHY

of bringing us to a certain attitude in metaphysics and theology, rather than in the particular content of his thought. He has discovered the weaknesses of the theoretic attitude of indecision and the necessity for the would-be philosopher to realize actual freedom as the capacity of a self-conscious subject to make responsible choices. In the *Grenzsituationen* in which such choices are called for, the thinker can become consciously aware of the contradictions within his own nature, the possibilities before him, and the kinds of authority which he finally recognizes. Kierkegaard described this total experience as "choice of oneself." The Nazi apologists are giving us a travesty of such "*Existenz*" in their insistence on the right of decision of the sacred nation, responsible to nothing but its own inner destiny. To Kierkegaard "choice of oneself" meant a personal venture of the individual soul before God. In this he plumbed some of the same depths as Augustine and Pascal. But to him, as perhaps to them (and to his contemporary, and in some ways kindred spirit, Cardinal Newman), the individual soul before God was a reality so exclusively "luminous" that he throws little light on the ways in which personal existential consciousness develops in responsive communication with others. Here he has been supplemented, with considerable psychological penetration, by Jaspers.

None of these books makes easy reading. It is of the essence of the dialectical philosophy of personality that almost everything that you can say about it must at once be qualified and countered by saying something like the opposite. In lesser hands this may well be an excuse for contradicting oneself and having it both ways; but in a thinker of real psychological and religious penetration it may be the method of saying anything significant about something as paradoxical as human existence.

I have noticed one misquotation in Dr. Lowrie's book. Burke's "Vice itself lost half its evil by losing all its grossness" appears on p. 117 as "Vice gaining more of evil by losing half its grossness." This rendering is a contradiction of the original saying which can hardly be defended as "dialectical."

DOROTHY M. EMMET.

Philosophy and the Concepts of Modern Science. By OLIVER L. REISER. (New York and London: Macmillan Co., 1935. Pp. xvii + 323. Price 15s.)

Professor Reiser is concerned about the state of human affairs. Intellectually, the development of physics has produced antinomies which he thinks are a logical scandal. Practically, we pass from economic crises to political despotism, and possibly to war. There seems to be collapse or regression in all spheres. The scientists have given us power but not knowledge, and they have neglected human nature. It is for the philosopher to co-ordinate scientific results, discover the general principles of human activity, including knowledge, indicate how to restore the intellectual prestige of science, and to apply its results to human welfare. One may share much of Professor Reiser's concern while being doubtful about his philosophical programme. Certainly its results are disappointing. Professor Reiser regards his book, *inter alia*, as a refutation of logical positivism, but he might study with advantage the methods of the logical positivists. The great defect of his book is a complete absence of any logical and critical distinction between types of problem and their appropriate treatment. He accepts, e.g., quite uncritically all statements of scientists, whether they are philosophizing about "dual" tables or stating, *qua* scientists, the results of research. He has a passion for facts which he scatters lavishly throughout his pages, and frequently, though interesting,

NEW BOOKS

they are quite irrelevant. Consequently, he offers speculative scientific hypotheses as the solution of philosophical problems, to which they are inappropriate. Nor does he seem to realize that even to a scientific problem such hypotheses are useless unless some means of testing them is indicated. This typical confusion of problems is shown in his treatment of the intellectual "crisis" in science. He regards it entirely (p. 57) as a conflict between physics and the laws of thought since physicists regard the electron both as a wave and a corpuscle, and so deny the law of contradiction. He gives no analysis of what it can *mean* to say that physics "conflicts" with the laws of thought. Nor does he mention such other philosophical problems as the analysis or re-definition of such concepts as "cause," "space," "time," "prediction," "determination" required by the Heisenberg principle. Indeed, he accepts without discussion the distinction between *dynamical* and *statistical* laws. Incidentally, he describes the first as "causal and *necessary*," and the second as "probable or *contingent*" (p. xii), which is inexcusable in any philosopher since Hume. But the "crisis" is due, he thinks, to the unsolved problem of the relation between physical facts and consciousness, i.e. between brain and mental states. He then elaborates hypotheses of physical causes or parallels for conscious processes, suggesting consciousness as a dimension of physical space (p. 173), as a chemical reaction caused by radiation (p. 158), and the laws of logic as similar to the laws of light (p. 118). He treats the "crisis," i.e., as a *scientific* problem. But whatever his suggestions are worth scientifically as explanations of the physical causes of consciousness, they are utterly irrelevant to the philosophical problem of the definition of scientific terms and the relation between logic and physics.

Part 2, on Philosophy and the Social Sciences, includes discussions of history, ethics, religion, and social reform. Much is made of "emergent evolution," though we are not given much help with the use of that blessed word "emerge," which remains as misty as ever. Professor Reiser has some valuable things to say by the way, however, on the need for social change. The last chapter on "The Social Objectives of Humanism" is particularly interesting, though it strikes a European as somewhat optimistic.

MARGARET MACDONALD.

Science and Common Sense: An Aristotelian Excursion. By W. R. THOMPSON, F.R.S. With a Preface by JACQUES MARITAIN. (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1937. Pp. vii+233. Price 7s. 6d.)

The principal thesis of this book, the work of a distinguished biologist and more than amateur philosopher, is briefly that those who seek knowledge of nature can neither cut loose from common sense, nor dispense in the long run with philosophy. The defence of this position entails a critique of knowledge in general, and a survey of the principles and methods employed in the sciences, particularly in physics and biology. If this programme seems a trifle hackneyed—and we must admit that it is not novel—it must at once be emphasized that the author's treatment of his theme raises it from this condition. The "ideological context" of the discussion is French neo-scholasticism: it is indeed, as its sub-title remarks, an Aristotelian excursion.

Common Sense includes (is equivalent to?) what Dr. Thompson calls "normal logic" and the "primary intention of the senses." "Scientific method," he observes, "is not the test of our intuition of the universe; it is our intuition of the universe that is the test of scientific method" (p. 52). If the physicist finds himself at odds with, let us say, the principle of contradiction, or with

PHILOSOPHY

our intuition of space as three dimensional, and of time as yielding a genuine simultaneity, then it is the physicist, and not logic or common sense, which must yield. "... if in some of their recent flights, men of science have thought to give practical proof of the liberation of Science from the bonds of Common Sense, it is evident that they are entertaining an illusion" (p. 26).

Physics, he argues in effect, escaped from the fire of philosophy only to fall into the frying-pan of mathematics. Thus physicists have turned from their proper field—the sensibly apprehensible—and from their proper method—induction—to embrace deductions which are in principle incapable of adding to, or correcting their knowledge of nature. "The mathematical machine works with unerring precision; but what we get out of it is nothing more than a rearrangement of what we put into it."

Not only physicists, it appears, have been thus seduced from their true calling, but the biologists also. These, too, have attempted by deductions from generalizations, e.g. about form and function, to achieve knowledge of the detail of nature without going to the labour of investigating it.

The greater part of his long chapter on *The Use and Abuse of Philosophy* is devoted to a subtle and valuable discussion of finalism, its modes, and its role in science. Bacon's attitude to final causes, he maintains, has been falsified by the foundation upon finalistic principles of whole branches of science. *Intrinsic* finality may, he agrees, be adequate to the needs of biology, but on philosophical grounds he argues for a wider finalism. The general (and timely) trend of this section is toward an Aristotelian explanation of things in their causes—all *four causes*, not merely in their *efficient* causes, and still less in a mathematical equation from which even the efficient cause has been eliminated.

Dr. Thompson concludes with a criticism of the doctrine of evolution. This capital hypothesis is now treated coldly by many biologists since its essentially philosophical character has been understood. On the evidential side, too, it would appear to be in serious case. "It seems certain," he observes, "that there has been *some* evolution, but we cannot decide upon *a priori* principles how much. Natural science has no key to this problem" (p. 212). As to the mode of such evolution as may justly be supposed, the only certitude is that Darwin's account in terms of an infinity of minute variations is untenable on the evidence, most of which, on the contrary, tells in favour of a mutation hypothesis in its older (or large scale) form. The author cites some quite plain evidence telling in favour of the supposedly extinct Lamarckian view. Yet "none of the evolutionary hypotheses now available permits a satisfactory integration of the facts." To the biological laity Dr. Thompson's illustrations drawn from his own field are likely to prove as interesting as they are fresh and arresting.

After several readings, however, I am not clear as to just what relation the author does take to obtain between natural science and philosophy. Of philosophy he remarks very early that it is a deductive study of "*Being as such*." But, we may ask, what can be added to that which our Father Parmenides said of *Being as such*? And where do evolutionary views (which are conceded to be philosophical) stand in relation to such a philosophy? It would appear that there is, on this view, an intermediate, a kind of natural philosophy, between the natural sciences (which deal inductively with the sensible) and metaphysics (which treats deductively of Being as such).

The author, like most neo-scholastics, discloses (e.g. when referring to "a primordial metaphysical necessity as inevitable as the principle of contradiction" (p. 223)) a surprising assurance at points where, to the uninitiated, doubt does not appear mere impiety to reason or, indeed, to Common

NEW BOOKS

Sense. Certainly there is much in this book which many will want to question; but no less certainly there is much which most readers at all concerned about science or philosophy will find suggestive. The brevity of this notice ought not to be taken as the measure of its value.

RALPH E. STEDMAN.

Guide to the Philosophy of Morals and Politics. By C. E. M. JOAD. (London: Gollancz, Ltd., 1938. Pp. 816. Price 6s. net.)

This is a fatter guide than Dr. Joad's last, but he is, I think, even a better talker, and that is saying a great deal. The responsibilities of success seem to have improved his quality. He popularizes, but he does not vulgarize, and it is the gusto and vitality of his exposition that, in the main, carries the reader on.

The plan of exposition is simple and captivating. Ethics and politics, we are told, went together in the writings of Plato and of Aristotle. They parted company during some critical centuries of the modern period, but in the present century have revived a very close companionship.

This story may be over-simplified. Dr. Joad's short account of "the split" seems to me to be rather shaky. Protestantism as a historical phenomenon cannot be identified with individualism. It was largely political, even in a secular sense, and Dr. Joad's opinion (p. 134) that the political theory of the Middle Ages has few merits might, I think, be vigorously disputed. That, however, is a minor point.

Dr. Joad begins with a most spirited account of the immortal argument of the *Republic*, Book II, and he seems to me to stick resolutely to his programme of using the discussion of Socratic-Platonic theory as a means of eliciting the logic of civil philosophy. I do not think so highly of what he says about Aristotle, but that may be only my misfortune. In the second part of his book he deals with ethics (after the "split"), in the third with politics, in the fourth with the "reunion" of ethics and politics in fascism, communism, idealistic theory, and the (relatively) free democracies. I cannot, of course, review all the bigger points he raises. His method, on the whole, is detailed rather than impressionistic. He sketches, but tries to avoid sketchiness. Still, I can make some observations.

I find Part II rather unsatisfactory. That, in part, may be bad luck for me. If Dr. Joad is right in his exposition of the authors I have studied most closely, I should have to unlearn rather a lot. That, of course, need not upset anyone except myself, and it would not in any case entitle me to be suspicious of what Dr. Joad says about matters with which I am less familiar. I can, however, make some more general comments. Dr. Joad is fairly liberal with quotations, but he very seldom gives the references. One sympathizes with his desire to avoid masses of footnotes, but anyone who wants to explore the context of the passages quoted, or (in very rare cases, I think) may be suspicious about their verbal accuracy, is asked to do rather too much. Again Dr. Joad as an expositor is frequently inclined to use his own illustrations instead of his authors' illustrations, and I frequently found some difficulty in distinguishing between the voice of the expositor and the voice of the author.

These are small points in themselves, although they have some importance for a class of persons who may be interested in the matter, namely, teachers of ethics. A more serious objection, I think, is that although Dr. Joad plays a skilful and vigorous game, he has marked out the courts much less skilfully

PHILOSOPHY

(or so I think). His main principles of subdivision are (a) objective and subjective, (b) intuitionist and utilitarian. This should yield four classes, although a statement of Dr. Joad's on p. 159 may indicate that in his opinion cross-division is unavoidable. In any case I do not think he is at all successful in avoiding cross-division. The reason, I think, is the mixture of history and logic in his exposition, and the looseness in which he seems to be content to leave some of his terms. "Intuition," for him, is almost as vague as it is in common usage. It includes (a) alleged rational insight into deontology, (b) the "moral sense" in its usual historical sense, (c) the sense in which it may be held that hedonism rests upon the intuition that pleasure is good in itself. It also includes much else. In short, it is much too accommodating to yield a clear white line. "Subjective" and "objective" are also notoriously slippery terms, but Mr. Joad's use of them seems to me to be quite obviously confused. In explaining what he means he refers first of all to the objectivity of the external world (p. 159)—which seems irrelevant—later (p. 163) to the "subjectivity" of opinion. The latter is his usual ground of distinction, but he persistently misinterprets it as may be seen, very clearly, from one of his statements on p. 387. "If subjectivism is correct," he there says, "X is good" means "X produces a feeling of approval in me," or "X conduces to my advantage." Plainly the second sense is wholly objective. Similarly on pp. 316-317 Dr. Joad maintains quite falsely that a utilitarian ethics of actual consequences is open to the objection that it implies that it is sometimes our duty to do a wrong action. The reason he gives is that it is wrong to let a drowning man perish, since his life "may reasonably be expected" to be better than his death, and yet that if the rescued person subsequently beats his wife and murders his children he would have been better drowned. If the objectivist makes duty a matter of (reasonable) opinion, and rightness a matter of actual consequences (that is, if he distinguishes the two), he is immune from logical objection. If he identifies right with duty and duty with actual beneficent consequences, then, plainly, what might be reasonably expected to be right need not be right. (This example shows incidentally that it may be very important to distinguish between a mere personal feeling and a well-grounded opinion.)

In this Part Dr. Joad has most interest in the problems of free will and of ultimate value. I regret that I have space for brief comment only. Regarding the first, he concludes "that if the moral faculties . . . are feeling or akin to feeling, then the task of vindicating free will is wellnigh impossible; if on the other hand they are reason or akin to reason, then moral freedom may be plausibly maintained." It is plain that "freedom" in quite important senses (e.g. a certain capacity to do what one likes) escapes this conclusion, and I have not found much positive support for the conclusion in Dr. Joad's pages with the exception of two of them (which I think very true), namely, pp. 273-274. In his discussion of absolute value Dr. Joad seems to me to offer too general a conclusion to hearten him in what (as I surmise) he really wants to do, that is, to support his contention that men and women are the only bearers of the higher values, and therefore that totalitarianism in politics is insecurely based in comparison with a democratic ethos in the community. In his summary on p. 446 he appears to be advocating a theory of progress towards totalitarian pantheism.

Part III deals on rather stereotyped lines with the doctrines of the social contract, sovereignty, natural rights, and the like. It ends with a chapter on the idealistic theory of the State that leads towards Part IV. In Part III the guide seems to me to do his job very usefully; but I shall pass to Part IV.

I have already mentioned the chief topics of this Part. His discussion of

NEW BOOKS

them seems to me to be the best part of his book. The method employed, partly no doubt because so much historical discussion has preceded it, is freer than in the earlier books; but it is a gain to avoid even the appearance of tension between logic and erudition. (I hasten to add that I do not mean that the discussion is ill-informed. The reverse seems to me to be true.)

The author's determination to be impartial and to indicate clearly where he is pressing some view of his own is more difficult to preserve about contemporary affairs than in discussion of the preterite, but it seems to me that he has been resolute as well as successful in this, the most difficult part of his self-imposed task. His account of Fascism (including Nazism) is sympathetic and discriminating. His chapter on Communism gains vastly from the argument of his book as a whole, and particularly from his ability to compare Lenin's communism with Plato's. Similarly, his defence of "democracy" is temperate. He is very well aware of the difficulties that have to be faced regarding the extent to which the activities of the State should be limited to the background, or thrust into the foreground of the good life of sociable men and women. He is aware that the principle of liberty need not be indefeasible, but he also provides sound general arguments for refusing to put even the experts into a sort of military command, and his discussion benefits enormously from his understanding of the relations between civil servants and others in the government of a democratic country.

JOHN LAIRD.

On p. 179, l. 23, "Thomas" should be "Samuel," on p. 172 the name should be Prichard.

The Future of Christianity. By EDGAR SHEFFIELD BRIGHTMAN. (New York: The Abingdon Press. 1937. Pp. 158. Price 1 dollar 50 cents.)

Professor Brightman, who holds a chair of philosophy at Boston University, gives us a very readable book, untechnical, and thoughtful. He begins with a chapter on prediction scientific and religious, and in these days the scientist is also amongst the prophets. He cites some interesting predictions concerning history, for example Tolstoy's forewarning in 1884 of the Communist revolution. He then passes to a chapter on the future of the Bible and Church, a frank statement of loss and gain which, though dealing with the United States in particular, is in general true of the conditions in this country. The next chapter is oddly named the future of God. This does not simply mean as one would expect the future of belief in God, but also "the future existence and plans of God." Actually it is the future of values rather than of God which is envisaged. The last chapter deals with the future of man, a chapter which comes nearer than any other to dealing with the subject of the book as a whole. If it is asked exactly what this book has to offer, the reply is that it is the judgment of an educated thinker, with Christian sympathies, on the present situation. It is neither pessimistic nor yet blind to the dangers of the day. Professor Brightman believes stoutly in the goodness of the human heart. He believes in ideals. He believes in God. In days when so many prophets walk in sackcloth, Professor Brightman's reasoned optimism is a reminder that there is another side to the picture.

E. S. WATERHOUSE.

PHILOSOPHY

Books received also:—

- E. S. DUCKETT. *The Gateway to the Middle Ages*. New York and London: The Macmillan Co. 1938. Pp. xiii + 620. 21s.
- A. A. LUCE. *Charles Frederick D'Arcy: 1859-1938*. (From Proceedings of the British Academy, vol. xxiv.) London: Oxford University Press, Humphrey Milford. 1938. Pp. 19. 1s. 6d.
- A. SHANKS. *An Introduction to Spinoza's Ethic*. London: Macmillan & Co. 1938. Pp. v + 103. 4s. 6d.
- VARIOUS AUTHORS. *Where Theosophy and Science Meet: A Stimulus to Modern Thought*. Part I: *Nature: From Macrocosm to Microcosm*. Edited by D. D. Kanga. Adyar, Madras: The Adyar Library Association. 1938. Pp. xxv + 163. 3s. 6d. R. 1.14.
- VARIOUS. *Money Enough for Everyone*. By a Group of Scientists. St. Albans: J. Sault, Victoria Press. 1938. Pp. 82. 1s. 6d.
- Masaryk on Thought and Life. Conversations with Karel Čapek*. (Translated from the Czech by M. and R. Weatherall.) London: G. Allen & Unwin, Ltd. 1938. Pp. 214. 7s. 6d.
- G. VAN DER LEEUW. *Religion in Essence and Manifestation. A Study in Phenomenology*. (Translated by J. E. Turner.) London: G. Allen & Unwin, Ltd. 1938. Pp. 709. 25s.
- G. C. FIELD. *Some Problems of the Philosophy of History*. (Hertz Lecture, 1938.) London: Oxford University Press, Humphrey Milford. 1938. Pp. 31. 1s. 6d.
- G. H. MEAD. *The Philosophy of the Act*. (Edited with introduction by C. W. Morris; in collaboration with J. M. Brewster, A. M. Dunham, and D. L. Miller.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press. London: Cambridge University Press. 1938. Pp. lxxxiv + 696. \$5; 22s. 6d.
- R. W. CHURCH. *An Essay on Critical Appreciation*. London: G. Allen & Unwin, Ltd. 1938. Pp. 299. 10s. 6d.
- A. KOLNAI. *The War against the West*. (Preface by W. Steed.) London: V. Gollancz, Ltd. 1938. Pp. 711. 18s.
- J. MACDONALD. *Some Suggestions towards a revised Philosophy of Education*. (University of London Institute of Education lecture.) London: Oxford University Press, Humphrey Milford. 1938. Pp. 25. 1s.
- A. A. BOWMAN. *Studies in the Philosophy of Religion*. (Introduction by N. Kemp Smith.) London: Macmillan & Co. 1938. Vol. I: Pp. xlviii + 423; Vol. II: xiii + 438. 30s. the two volumes.
- R. METZ. *A Hundred Years of British Philosophy*. (Translated by J. W. Harvey, T. E. Jessop, H. Sturt; edited by J. H. Muirhead.) London: G. Allen & Unwin, Ltd.; New York: The Macmillan Co. 1938. Pp. 828. 25s.
- W. H. V. READE. *The Problem of Inference*. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press. Humphrey Milford. 1938. Pp. 174. 7s. 6d.
- A. C. CAMPBELL. *In Defence of Free Will*. (Inaugural Address.) Glasgow: Jackson, Son & Co. 1938. Pp. 31. 1s. 6d.
- B. T. REYNOLDS AND R. G. COULSON. *Human Needs in Modern Society*. London: J. Cape, Ltd. 1938. Pp. 284. 10s. 6d.
- VARIOUS AUTHORS. *The College Journey. An Introduction to the Fields of College Study*. (Edited by R. B. Levinson.) New York: T. Nelson & Sons. 1938. Pp. xiii + 569.
- E. M. POPE. *India in Portuguese Literature*. Osmania University, India. 1937. Pp. xviii + 300.
- MRS. RHYS DAVIDS. *What was the Original Gospel in "Buddhism"?* London: The Epworth Press. 1938. Pp. 144. 3s. 6d.

NEW BOOKS

- TEJA SINGH. *Sikhism: Its Ideals and Institutions*. London and Calcutta: Longmans, Green & Co. 1938. Pp. vii + 146. 3s. 6d.
- B. SCHULTZER. *Observation and Protocol Statement*. Copenhagen: Levin & Munksgaard; London: Williams & Norgate, Ltd. 1938. Pp. ix + 151. 7s. 6d.
- W. R. PATERSON. *The Passions of Life. Being the Search for an Ideal*. London: Williams & Norgate, Ltd. 1938. Pp. 220. 6s.
- E. S. RUSSELL. *The Behaviour of Animals: An Introduction to its Study*. (Second Edition.) London: E. Arnold & Co. 1938. Pp. vii + 196. 10s. 6d.
- M. FRANCÉS. *Spinoza dans les pays Néerlandais de la seconde moitié du XVII^e siècle*. Première partie. Paris: F. Alcan. 1937. Pp. viii + 365. Fr. 50.
- J. ET P. DE LA COURT. *La Balance Politique*. (Livre premier traduit par M. Francés.) Paris: F. Alcan. 1937. Pp. xxvii + 127. Fr. 30.
- Actualités Scientifiques et Industrielles. Philosophie et Histoire de la Pensée Scientifique:*
- IV. H. Metzger. *Attraction Universelle et Religion Naturelle chez quelques Commentateurs Anglais de Newton*.
Première partie: "Introduction Philosophique." Pp. 53. Fr. 12.
- V. Deuxième partie: "Newton-Bentley-Whiston-Toland." Pp. 54-113. Fr. 15.
- VI. Troisième partie: "Clarke-Cheyne-Derham-Baxter-Priestley." Pp. 114-223. Fr. 23.
- Paris: Hermann & Cie. 1938.
- A. CONSENTINO. *Temps, Espace, Devenir, Moi: Les Sosies du Néant*. (Traduit par G. Frelat.) Paris: F. Alcan. 1938. Pp. 206. Fr. 35.
- D. ROUSTAN en collaboration avec P. SCHRECKER. *Œuvres Complètes de Malebranche*. (Édition critique.) Tome I: *De la Recherche de la Vérité*. Livres I et II. Paris: Boivin et Cie. 1938. Pp. xl + 491. Fr. 80.
- É. DURKHEIM. *L'Évolution Pédagogique en France. Les Origines à la Renaissance*. (Introduction par M. Halbwachs.) Paris: F. Alcan. 1938. Pp. 221. Fr. 25.
- A. MANOIL. *La Psychologie Expérimentale en Italie*. Paris: F. Alcan. 1938. Pp. viii + 489. Fr. 80.
- C. CHAMIÉ. *Principes Nouveaux de Psychologie: Leur application à l'étude des systèmes de connaissances et de la personnalité*. Paris: Hermann et Cie. 1937. Pp. 208.
- Bibliographie de la Philosophie*. Second Fascicule pour L'Année 1937. 1 (1937). 2. Paris: J. Vrin. 1938. Pp. xi + 343 + x.
- C. A. SACHELI. *Atto e Valore*. Firenze: G. C. Sansoni. 1938. Pp. 340. Lire 18.
- I. SCIACY. *Il Problema dello Stato nel Pensiero del Rousseau*. Con Appendice di Saggi Kantiani. Firenze: G. C. Sansoni. 1938. Pp. viii + 133. Lire 12.
- A. TESTA. *La Discorsività dell'Essere*. Firenze: G. C. Sansoni. 1938. Pp. 140. Lire 20.
- L. VIVANTA. *Il Concetto della Indeterminazione*. Firenze: Vallecchi. 1938. Pp. 231. Lire 10.
- E. SCHJOTH. *Gegenstands und Verhaltnis Lehre*. Oslo: J. Dybwad. 1938. Pp. 279.

CORRESPONDENCE

TO THE EDITOR OF *Philosophy*

SIR,

May I offer some (I hope) constructive comments on Dr. Bourke's article on "Responsibility, Freedom, and Determinism," in *Philosophy* for July 1938?

First, it will (I think) clarify the problem to recognize expressly that "freedom" denotes not a positive quality, but the absence (or at least incompleteness) of some determination. "Capricious freedom" is the absence of *all* determination, and must be rejected for the reasons correctly stated by Dr. Bourke. "Rational freedom," *qua* freedom, is "independence on the determining causes of the sensible world"; *qua* rational it is determination by reason. As Dr. Bourke points out, it is exemplified not only in moral action but also in knowledge.

But what is "neutral freedom"? Is this term anything more than a name for a problem, or a confession of ignorance as to its solution? Sometimes I act morally, determining myself by the law of reason; sometimes I act immorally, or "a-morally" (as the case may be), being determined by "causes of the sensible world." Since I do both, obviously I *can* do both—this is "neutral freedom." The problem is, *What* determines me to act sometimes on one side, sometimes on the other, of the line that divides the moral from the non-moral? One is tempted to postulate just the least trace of capricious freedom! But that has been shown to be inadmissible, since it denies, not safeguards, responsibility and moral value. So until we can show the existence of some third kind of determination which decides between natural and rational determination, "neutral freedom" remains but a name for the problem.

In what direction lies the solution? I would make a suggestion. How in fact do men try to promote morality? The answer is twofold—first by "rewards and punishments," secondly by persuasion. The first by itself cannot make men moral, it can at best make the moral choice easier by balancing inducements to outwardly right conduct against those to outwardly wrong conduct. Persuasion, however, is nothing but trying to bring rational determination into operation; and its success depends upon the person to be persuaded being already in some degree reasonable, that is, rationally determined.

Does not this indicate that the problem of freedom in the sphere of human action is not, How can one kind of determination replace and overthrow another? but rather, Where every event is describable in terms of an intermingling of different types of determination in varying proportions of relevance, how *in fact* does one or the other attain to dominant relevance in each case?

If so, the function of philosophy here is not to solve by *a priori* methods a problem set by experience; but rather to purge our statement of the problem from illegitimate *a priori* elements, and to send us back to concrete experience for its solution.

And that is where Religion comes in.

Yours faithfully,

F. C. LONG.

ST. JOHN'S RECTORY,
NEWPORT, CO. TIPPERARY.
July 1938.

THE BRITISH INSTITUTE OF PHILOSOPHY

(Incorporated under the Companies Acts 1908-1917 as a Company not for Profit but limited by Guarantee.)

President:

THE RT. HON. VISCOUNT SAMUEL, G.C.B., G.B.E., M.A., HON.D.C.L.

Chairman of the Council:

J. H. MUIRHEAD, M.A., LL.D., F.B.A.

Deputy Chairman of the Council:

A. D. LINDSAY, C.B.E., M.A., LL.D.

Hon. Treasurer:

THE RT. HON. LORD TWEEDSMUIR, C.H., G.C.M.G., D.C.L.

Director of Studies:

SYDNEY E. HOOPER, M.A.

Hon. Secretary:

P. M. ROSSDALE, LL.M.

INSTITUTE NOTES

LECTURE COURSES for the Michaelmas Term, Session 1938-39:—

"The Nature of Knowledge," a course of six weekly lectures by A. D. Woozley, M.A. (of The Queen's College, Oxford), on Fridays, at 5.45 p.m. at University Hall, 14 Gordon Square, W.C.1, beginning October 14th. Fee for the course, 12s. 6d. Members free.

"Speculative Philosophy," a class by The Director of Studies, on Wednesdays, at 5.45 p.m., at University Hall, 14 Gordon Square, W.C.1, in the Michaelmas and Lent Terms, beginning Michaelmas Term, October 19th (omitting October 26th); Lent Term, January 18th (omitting January 25th). Fee for the Session, £1 1s. Terminal, 12s. 6d. Members free.

The *Evening Meetings* for the Michaelmas Term of the Session will be held at University College, Gower Street, W.C.1, at 8.15 p.m., on the following dates:—

Tuesday, October 11th: Presidential Address. The Rt. Hon. Viscount Samuel, G.C.B., G.B.E., Hon. D.C.L.

Tuesday, November 15th: "The Development of Aristotle's Thought." Sir W. David Ross, K.B.E., Litt.D., LL.D., P.B.A.

Tuesday, December 13th: "Things in Themselves." Professor H. F. Hallett.

PHILOSOPHY

OBJECTS OF THE INSTITUTE.

The British Institute of Philosophy exists to bring leading exponents of various branches of Philosophy into direct contact with the general public, with the purpose of satisfying a need felt by many men and women in every walk of life for greater clearness and comprehensiveness of vision in human affairs.

With this broad educational purpose in view, the Institute—

- (1) Provides at suitable times in the day and evening courses of lectures by leading exponents in the more important subjects coming within the scope of Philosophy. All branches of Philosophy are represented—Ethics and Social Philosophy, the Philosophy of Law and of the Sciences, of the Fine Arts and of Religion, as well as Logic and Metaphysics and Psychology.

These lectures are free to members.

- (2) Issues a quarterly philosophical journal (free to members).
- (3) Proposes to form a philosophical Library.
- (4) Gives guidance and assistance to individuals in their philosophical reading.
- (5) Encourages research in Philosophy.
- (6) There are Local Centres of the Institute at Bangor, Cardiff, Liverpool, Manchester, Newcastle and Durham, and Sheffield.

Further information and forms of application for membership may be had on application to the Director of Studies, at University Hall, 14 Gordon Square, London, W.C.1.

[Suggested]

FORM OF BEQUEST

I bequeath to THE BRITISH INSTITUTE OF PHILOSOPHY the sum of free of duty, to be applied to the purposes of that Institute, and I declare that the receipt of the Honorary Secretary or other proper officer for the time being of that Institute, shall be sufficient discharge for the same.



A Hundred Years of British Philosophy

by Dr. RUDOLF METZ

"The best history of recent British philosophy . . . Dr. Metz writes with an intimate knowledge of England, an unrivalled mastery of historical detail, and a considerable power of lucid exposition." *Yorkshire Post* Library of Philosophy 25s. net
Please send for complete list of the Library of Philosophy

An Essay on Critical Appreciation

by R. W. CHURCH, M.A., D.Phil.

The author, well known for his books on philosophy, is here concerned with problems of æsthetics.

"A work of exceptional versatility and great philosophical power." *Times Literary Supplement* 10s. 6d. net

Symbolism and Belief

by EDWYN BEVAN

"I doubt if there is anyone, now living and writing, better qualified than Dr. Bevan to handle the delicate and elusive notions which may be grouped under the name of symbolism." *Sunday Times* 15s. net

Religion in Essence and Manifestation

by G. VAN DE LEEUW

"A really great book . . . Dr. Van de Leeuw writes as an anthropologist, and the religious experience of which he treats is that of the entire race and of all time." *Manchester Guardian* 25s. net

Religion of the Good Life: Zoroastrianism

by R. P. MASANI

"An account of what Zoroastrianism means and teaches . . . we know of nothing at once so simple and so informative for the general reader who is interested in Parsi ways and beliefs." *Aberdeen Press* 6s. net

GEORGE ALLEN AND UNWIN LTD

SCIENTIFIC BOOKS

Works in all branches of Science, English and Foreign, including PHILOSOPHY, supplied from stock, or obtained promptly to order. Catalogues of new books of all publishers post free on request.

H. K. LEWIS & Co. Ltd.

136, Gower Street Tel. EUSTON 4282. London, W.C.1

TWELVE RELIGIONS AND MODERN LIFE

by *Har Dayal, M.A., Ph.D.*

2s. 6d. net

"Twelve religions, including Christianity, Judaism and the religions of the East, considered from the standpoint of modern humanism."—*Times Literary Supplement*.

"This book is heartily welcome. The approach to the great religions, discussed in its pages, is wholly admirable."—*Modern Mystic*

"Dr. Dayal's unusual work."—*Public Opinion*

Modern Culture Institute, Edgware (Middx.)

THE SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW

Journal of the Institute of Sociology

EDITORIAL BOARD

A. M. Carr-Saunders, Alexander Farquharson, Morris Ginsberg

VOLUME XXX

JULY, 1938

No. 3

CONTENTS

Childless Marriages

R. R. Kuczynski

The Social Consequences of Industrial Transference: A Reply
Michael Daly

Social Origins of a Sample of Entrants to Glasgow University: Part II
Adam Collier

The Time Lag in the Recent Migration Movements within Great Britain
R. S. Walshaw

Bismarck's Social Policy and the Problem of State Socialism in Germany: Part II
Hans Rothfels

Annual Subscription: £1 1s. od. (post free).

Single Copies, 5s. 3d. (post free).

**LE PLAY HOUSE PRESS, 35 GORDON SQUARE,
LONDON, W.C.1**

PHILOSOPHY

THE JOURNAL OF THE BRITISH INSTITUTE
OF PHILOSOPHY

Edited by
SYDNEY E. HOOPER

with the assistance of

S. ALEXANDER	C. D. BROAD	WILLIAM BROWN
M. GINSBERG	G. DAWES HICKS	JULIAN S. HUXLEY
HAROLD J. LASKI	A. D. LINDSAY	J. H. MUIRHEAD
BERTRAND RUSSELL	L. S. STEBBING	G. F. STOUT
A. E. TAYLOR	CLEMENT C. J. WEBB	

CONTENTS

- I. CIVILIZATION
Viscount Samuel, G.C.B., G.B.E., M.A., Hon.D.C.L.
- II. GREAT THINKERS: (XIII) IMMANUEL KANT
Professor G. Dawes Hicks, F.B.A.
- III. THE PARADOXES OF KANT'S ETHICS
A. C. Ewing, M.A., Litt.D.
- IV. IS POLITICAL ACTIVITY UNDER A DIFFERENT LAW FROM THAT
OF PERSONAL ETHICS?
Hilda D. Oakeley, D.Lit.
- V. ECONOMICS AND PHILOSOPHY
Professor D. T. Jack
- VI. DISCUSSION:
 - (1) COLOUR: AN ALTERNATIVE STATEMENT
Helen Wodehouse, M.A., Ph.D.
 - (2) HUME'S DIALOGUES CONCERNING NATURAL RELIGION:
AN ANSWER TO DR. LAING
Ernest C. Mossner
- VII. PHILOSOPHICAL SURVEY
- VIII. NEW BOOKS
- IX. CONGRÈS INTERNATIONAL DES SCIENCES ANTHROPOLOGIQUES ET
ETHNOLOGIQUES
- X. CORRESPONDENCE
- XI. INSTITUTE NOTES

Published Quarterly

MACMILLAN & CO. LTD., LONDON

Price 3/6

Subscription 14/- Yearly, Post Free.

University of London

Library.

FRENCH INTROSPECTIVES

From Montaigne to André Gide

By P. MANSELL JONES

6s. net

Autobiography is in the fashion, yet as an art it receives little recognition from the critics. True autobiography is not the record of a life—biography in the first person—but a study of the self; and it is with certain French artists in introspection that Professor Mansell Jones is concerned.

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

The Principles of Mathematics

By BERTRAND RUSSELL, F.R.S. *The Principles of Mathematics*, first published in 1903, sets forth, as far as possible without mathematical or logic symbolism, the grounds in favour of the view that mathematics and logic are identical. This view has since been attacked, and in a new Preface the author defends this thesis against adverse opinions. 18s. net

The Philosophy of Leibniz

By BERTRAND RUSSELL, F.R.S. Leibniz's importance as a philosopher has become more evident owing to the recent growth of mathematical logic and the discovery of his manuscript on this and kindred subjects. New impression with a new Preface by the author. 12s. 6d. net

GEORGE ALLEN AND UNWIN

MACMILLAN

PSYCHOLOGY DOWN THE AGES

By C. SPEARMAN, Ph.D. (Leipzig), F.R.S.

EMERITUS PROFESSOR OF PSYCHOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

2 Volumes. With Illustrations. 30s. net

"*Psychology Down the Ages* is an eminently sane, judicious, and scientifically balanced work, easy to read and understand, and (to borrow the words of a reviewer of a former work of Spearman and apply them to this) the 'most distinguished British contribution to experimental psychology that has been made in recent years'. Indeed, both in comprehensiveness and clarity, it excels *The Abilities of Man*."—*Nature*

"These volumes will remain for some years the most reliable and complete of all modern histories of Psychology."—*Belfast News-Letter*

CRITICAL REALISM

Studies in the Philosophy of Mind and Nature

By G. DAWES HICKS

M.A. (CANTAB.); PH.D. (LEIPZIG); LITT.D. (MANCHESTER)

FELLOW OF THE BRITISH ACADEMY

AND EMERITUS PROFESSOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

About 16s. net

An attempt to justify the view that the world of physical nature consists not merely of quantitative elements but likewise of the qualitative features which we more or less accurately apprehend through mature sense-perceptions.

MACMILLAN

THE FALSE STATE

By HILDA D. OAKELEY

Author of *History and the Self*

"... a stimulating . . . and learned plea for Liberty."

Time and Tide. 6s. net

WILLIAMS & NORGATE

SCIENTIFIC BOOKS

Works in all branches of Science, English and Foreign, including PHILOSOPHY, supplied from stock, or obtained promptly to order. Catalogues of new books of all publishers post free on request.

H. K. LEWIS & Co. Ltd.

136, Gower Street

Tel. EUSTON 4282.

London, W.C.1

